

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF THE  
EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.  
APRIL, 1876.

---

ARTICLE I.

RECENT STUDIES IN CHRISTOLOGY.

By Prof. W. H. WYNN, A. M., Ames, Iowa.

*Christ and Humanity*, with a Review, Historical and Critical, of the Doctrine of Christ's Person. By HENRY M. GOODWIN. Harper & Brothers, New York. 1875.

*The Trinity*. By Rev. F. H. BURRIS. With an Introduction by Prof. JOSEPH HAVEN, D. D., LL. D. S. C. Griggs and Company, Chicago. 1874.

The works under review are contributions to the same general line of Christological inquiry, but, as original and exhaustive discussions, are by no means entitled to an equal place in our esteem. They are soundings in the same seas, but of widely contrasting depths. The authors approach their tasks, respectively, with a like zeal for the truth, and, for aught that appears, the same guileless method in the handling of their themes, but their powers of patient research and spiritual insight are so diverse, and the difference in their attainments so marked, that, except as tokens of a new impulse in the direction of the Christological problem, the systems they propound can have no rival claims in our regard.

Mr. Goodwin is a thorough theologian, and is familiar  
Vol. VI. No 2. 21

with the history of Christian sentiment in the line of his discussion. He knows what theories have been proposed in the past, and is able definitely to grasp their varying shades of difference, and set them in juxtaposition with his own. Indeed a marked feature of his book is a masterly summary of Dr. Dorner's great work, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre von der Person Christi*, to which he is indebted, not for the original suggestion of the view of the Person of Christ he advocates, but for the historic back-ground on which his own discoveries are set in relief. Practically Mr. Goodwin introduces to the American public this masterpiece of all theological writing, by putting into a condensed and popular form what otherwise, even in the Edinburgh translation, is comparatively inaccessible for massiveness of erudition. He determines in this way his own intellectual affinity with the past, and sets up landmarks whereby his place in the progress of Christological sentiment can be clearly defined. In short, Mr. Goodwin knows the difficulties of the problem; apparently Mr. Burris does not. Mr. Burris throws himself with much ardor on what he conceives to be the teaching of the Scriptures themselves on the subject of the Trinity, ignoring the creeds, and oblivious of all the speculative difficulties which have harrassed men's minds in the past. The Bible teaches him that the whole Trinity is concentrated in the single embodiment of our Lord Jesus Christ. The "holy thing" that was born of the Virgin Mary was alone entitled to be called the "Son of God." The inscrutable Jehovah, the everlasting Father, came down upon our planet in the form of a suffering sinless man, and the humanity he assumed was the only begotten Son, and the Holy Spirit was but the forthgoing of his divine power to save, through the medium of the humanity he assumed.

Mr. Burris thinks that the Scriptures clearly teach "that there is a divine Trinity, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost; that these are not a Trinity of persons, but are the three essentials of the one God in Christ; that by the Father we are to understand the Deity; by the Son, the human nature which the Deity assumed when he became incar-

nate; and by the Holy Ghost, God working in us through his Son; and that hence in Christ is not only the humanity, but also the Deity, and in him alone is the divine Trinity. Finally, that this Trinity did not, therefore, exist until God became incarnate, and that this is the reason why it is never mentioned in the Old Testament." In sustaining these propositions, he calls in successively the testimony of Christ himself, of John, of Paul, and of the Old Testament Scriptures, and apparently there are no exegetical difficulties in his way. The past has no weight with him. For fifteen centuries or longer, men have misapprehended the Scriptural teaching on this subject, under the incubus of some Platonic fiction, or Gnostic hallucination, which impelled Origen to invent the preposterous doctrine of the eternal generation of the Son of God. There is no need of the obsolete terms *Logos*, *Hypostasis*, *Kenosis*, in Mr. Burris' theology; all that mazy fabric of scholasticism dissolves in an instant before his simple and unembarrassed exposition of the undoubted teaching of the Holy Scriptures on the subject.

While making this strenuous appeal to the Scriptures, Mr. Burris does not hesitate, when the exigency of his argument requires it, to appeal just as emphatically to the teachings of reason. When he is urging that three persons cannot be one, nor one three, he is so powerfully impressed with the rights of the human reason in the premises, that he cannot believe that the sacred volume teaches any such monstrous doctrine. "The Author of that venerable book is the author of our immortal spirits; and he gave it, not to contradict the laws of our being, and to overthrow those innate principles of truth which he has implanted within us, but that it might guide us in the way of peace and safety." Having consented to respect the claims of reason, he should have asked in what spirit she was likely to receive the terms in which he has formulated the Scriptural doctrine on the subject of the Trinity. "There is a Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and these are not a Trinity of persons, but are the three *essentials* of the one God in Christ." "By the Father we are to understand the Deity; by the Son, the human na-

ture which the Deity assumed when he became incarnate; and by the Holy Ghost, God working in us through his Son." Well, then, the three *essentials* of the one God are, (a) the infinite and sole personality of Jehovah; (b) the humanity he assumed in time; (c) the forthgoing divine energy which through the humanity he exercised over the hearts of men. But on what principle of reason can a humanity, assumed in time, be accounted one of the *essentials* of the eternal and unchangeable Godhead? As Mr. Burris conceives that humanity, it has no ground in the eternal potentialities of the divine nature, but is simply an accident or incident in the process of revelation, assumed because God in his sovereign wisdom chose that method of expressing himself to men. The incarnation is a caprice. The humanity assumed, having no root in the eternities, is of necessity impersonal, and as much a creation of the overshadowing Spirit of the Highest as is any fleshly body coming into being in the ordinary process of human generation. And now how shall we conceive of a finite creation of God, an impersonal product of his power, as constituting one of the three essentials of the one God in Christ?

The human reason revolts from such a conclusion, and yet persists in inquiring what ground there is in the eternal habitudes, so to speak, for this supreme event of God manifest in the flesh. The search is not interdicted. From the days of the Nicene Fathers unto the present time, those most profoundly gifted with spiritual insight, and with the richest stores of Biblical learning on such topics, have uniformly believed that the Holy Scriptures both encourage and proximately answer the inquiry. With Mr. Burris, the great doctrine of the Logos, the eternally generated hypostasis in the Godhead—the pre-existent Jesus—is absurd to the reason, and utterly in opposition to the uniform teaching of the Word of God. A divine Trinity he admits, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but these are distinctions which originated in time, although it does not occur to him that the first term of that sacred formula is the only one in that event, that can receive the epithet divine. The incarnation is, ac-



cordingly, a supernatural, self-sufficient event—the infinite God making for himself a finite tabernacle in the flesh, for no other reason than that, in his unapproachable wisdom, and wonderful condescension, he saw fit so to do. At first blush this may seem a simple and uninvolved statement of the Scriptural teaching on that subject, but a little examination will show how completely it suppresses the profounder elements of the problem.

Assuming to rest the weight of his argument quite exclusively on the explicit teaching of the word of God, the author has, for some unaccountable reason, omitted from the testimony of Jesus, especially as it is recorded in the Gospel of John, those remarkable passages, which, if taken in connection with the Prologue to the same Gospel, cannot well be construed to mean anything else than the personal existence of Jesus, prior to his advent in the flesh. "Ye are from beneath; I am from above." "I came down from heaven." "No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath brought him forth to view." "No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." "Father glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was"—words to which only the sublime Prologue is a key: "In the beginning was the Logos, and the Logos was with God, and God was the Logos; and the Logos was made flesh." The Prologue itself teaches the eternal hypostasis of the Logos so unmistakably, that those opposing the doctrine, with any pretensions to the Biblical learning involved in the controversy, have preferred discovering in it the traces of some Gnostic logomachy, which the author may have had with Cerinthus, rather than risk the very futile effort of explaining its eternal distinctions away. Yet Mr. Burris has undertaken the hopeless task of explaining away those distinctions. He says: "As Moses represents each act of creation as having been performed by the *command* or *word* of God, so John states that by this *word* 'all things were made,' and that without it 'was not any thing made that was made.'"

He thinks that John uses the term in exactly the same sense in which the Psalmist uses it, when he says that "by the *word* of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the breath of his mouth." "He *spake*, and it was done: he *commanded*, and it stood fast." He urges that John, and all the inspired writers, "talk about the words of the Lord, as they do about the words of the King, and mean by both precisely the same thing." The Logos, then, according to him, is but the *utterance* of the mind of God. But what if it should appear that no such utterance is at all a possible reality in the exercise of the infinite functions,—that used in this sense it is a figure of speech and nothing more? Accepting this, what meaning would there be in these opening passages of the Gospel of John? "In the beginning was a figure of speech, &c."

Or, admitting the profoundest meaning that can be attached to the term Logos, outside of the eternal hypostasis; conceiving it a word, not like that of a king, but the expression in any form, of that which must otherwise lie unrevealed and unrevealable in the abysses of the Infinite, yet that definition is so nearly synonymous with the simple predication of self-revelment on the part of the Deity, that one is at a loss to know why the Evangelist should so carefully distinguish it from God, and then come back with equal precision to make its identity with him sure. Why not directly say: In the beginning God began to reveal himself, and in the process of self-revelation manifested himself in his Son? Clearly it is impossible to see that the term revelation, substituted for the hypostasis, would make any better sense in the connection than "*figure of speech*." In the beginning was the revelation, and the revelation was with God, and God was the revelation.

Just here the hypostasis dawns upon our view, and the remarkable scope and grandeur of Mr. Goodwin's theory of the Person of Christ are in marked contrast with the earnest gropings of Mr. Burris. The capacity for self-revelment must be eternally inherent in, and generated by, the otherwise unrevealed and unrevealable Deity. The abyss between

the Infinite and the finite is absolutely and forever impassable, except as this revealing element in the constitution of the Deity shall bridge the immeasurable spaces, and open out the channels through which his creative energy may ceaselessly flow. This is the office of the Logos. Therefore, by him were all things made, and without him was not any thing made that was made. Now Mr. Goodwin, following the line of thought indefinitely projected by Apollinaris in the fourth century, and perpetuated in the Monophysite sects down even to the seventh century, and here and there broached all along through the centuries up even to the present time, systematically defines the Logos to be the Divine Humanity, the eternally generated prototype in accordance with which the human being was originally fashioned. All material creation looks to man as its consummating limit, and the new creation looks to the *ideal man* which the incarnate Logos brought into the world. The Logos, therefore, was immanent in the material world, as a preliminary *excursus*, so to speak, for the creation of man, and this, also, with the view of letting down into human history its own epitome, as the ideal type toward which the aspiring effort of the race should be directed. Through it God created, that, in its further evolvment, he might *new-create* in his own image, and after his own likeness, the crowning product of his hand. Therefore John is careful to weave together the creation and the incarnation on the same thread,—to put them into the same system, with the underlying *nexus* of the eternally generated Logos. Distinct from God, yet forever one with him in essence, the Logos was that by which the worlds were made, and that which in due time was manifested (*σαρξενέ-νετο*) in the flesh.

Going back to Moses, Mr. Goodwin finds the mystery of the Logos at least proximately resolved in those remarkable words: "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness,"—words always profoundly significant, but becoming a thousand fold more suggestive, when made the key to the incarnate love of God in Christ. God first created man in his own image, and then subsequently brought that

image down in the flesh. The first was the copy; the second was the original. The first man was of the earth, earthy; the second was the Lord from heaven. The finite copy has all the lineaments of the Infinite original, therefore the human of the human must be an effigy of the divine-human. The prototype after which man was fashioned being in God, we must note concerning it, (*a*) that it was a humanity, since in its essential features it was the counterpart of the humanity it impressed on the creature; (*b*) it was with God before it was copied into the creature, and must, therefore, have been eternally inherent in his nature; (*c*) that, nevertheless, being a human prototype in God, it must have meant some specific determination of his infinite nature not predicable of the Absolute in itself—an eternal self-determination of the divine nature, which is all that can reasonably be meant by the term hypostasis as applied to the Godhead. That Divine Humanity is the eternal Son of God,—not the first and highest creature, as the Arians were wont to figure him,—not a creature at all; nor, on the other hand, so wholly one with the Absolute, as the Patripassians maintained, that both in creation and the incarnation, it is but the inscrutable, infinite One going forth *in propria persona* to the exhibition of his glory. No! it was in the beginning with God, and was God; and by it the worlds were made; and it became flesh.

Doubtless to call it a person, in the sense in which we popularly use that term, and distinguish it by such rigid metaphysical boundaries, as we are wont to use in defining our finite personalities, is as damaging a misapprehension of the doctrine as Mr. Burris conceives it to be. The term is unfortunate as having no sanction in Scriptural usage, and as being the catch-word of Trinitarian extremists, who, in their blindness, sacrifice the divine unity to a set of technical distinctions, which practically enthrone three Gods in the world. But the truth is, it is only at the point of the Logos that the personality of the Absolute comes clearly to view. Beyond him all is a dark, interminable abyss. We stand upon the hither side of it, and gaze out upon it as men in a

dream. Infinite! Infinite! the very effort to contemplate it is attended with a paralysis of our powers. In the eternal Son of God, however, our affinity with the Infinite is assured. "Let not your heart be troubled, ye believe in God, believe also in me." "No man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath brought him forth to view." But for the Logos, philosophy would consign the Deity to the region of nescience, or, under some dark generalization of the unknowable, extinguish him forever from the minds of men. Now we know that the prototype of our humanity is in God, and that God is a person in some sense analogous to that in which we are conscious of personality in ourselves. Now we know that he is an intelligent, sympathetic Being, that he thinks, and feels, and loves, and is susceptible of such moral emotions as we have discovered to be the imperishable ingredients of our own nature. The only begotten, which is in the bosom of the Father,—the eternally generated Son of God—the Divine Human has taught us this. The human *πνεῦμα* is the created image of him. Our kinship with the Logos will justify our judgments of God, and if unhappily our judgments should be darkened and perverted by sin, another forthgoing of the Logos in the finite molds of flesh and blood will bring that ideal humanity before the eyes of men, in such a way of tutelary illustration and power, as no other manifestation of the divine glory could rival. "He dwelt among us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." The Divine Humanity first copied itself in man, and then *became* man.

Now it is easy to see how this new view of the Logos, as propounded by Mr. Goodwin, will suggest an adequate ground for the incarnation, while the ardent Patripassianism of Mr. Burris is wholly out at sea. According to Mr. Goodwin the eternal Son of God did not assume the human, when he came in the flesh. He *was* the human before he came. The old view of a divine and a human soul in the complex personality of Jesus; or of the two heterogeneous natures, acting

sporadically in the unfolding consciousness of the Messiah ; or of the two natures, without commingling, sharing each the attributes of the other, after the manner of the *communicatio idiomatum* of the Lutheran reformers—every dualistic view, within the general drift of the Nicene and Chalcedon Symbols, is fated to bring one mystery to the solution of another ; while, indeed, the simple key to that mystery is found in the very familiar fact that God created man originally in his own image. The eternal Son did not need to assume the human, for he had it with him. Therefore instead of holding that there are two natures in Christ, one of which is his own, by virtue of his being the eternal Word of God, and the other assumed and alien, consisting of a fleshly body and a reasonable soul, as is currently believed, we submit if it would not seem more in accordance with the very nature of the Logos, to hold, simply that the Divine-human came in the flesh ; and that in Jesus there was but one nature, and that not essentially different from ours, because the prototype in accordance with which ours was framed.

We should not weary with repeating that the nature of man is a *simulacrum* of the divine, since it is a fact conceded on any hypothesis, and lies so fundamentally at the heart of Mr. Goodwin's Christology. When sin came it did not obliterate this image, although doubtless it smirched and soiled it sadly, but there were left always those human traits that must forever distinguish the man from the brute. There are certain powers and attributes inseparable from a moral nature, of which man cannot be utterly deprived, as, in his most degraded condition, he cannot descend wholly to the level of the beast. Man has the power to recognize right, the power to yield himself to the sway of its eternal prerogatives, the power to know, and love, and do. He has reason, and the distinctively human faculty of putting forth his mental processes in articulate speech. He is a man in proportion as his capacity for free determination remains unimpaired, and the light of conscience within him unobscured by the exhalations of passion and lust. But these are divine traits no less than human, and human no less than divine.

Should they become blurred in the creature, and threaten to go out in the gathering death-damps of depravity, it will then be competent for the Divine Humanity to light them up again by his own radiant presence in the flesh. That will not be assuming the human, but making a new revelation of the human from its ineffable fountain. The parent globe will come where its offspring are wildly aberrant from their orbits, and bring them back again by its supernal attractions. That will be God in the society of his children, and there will be no call for the blending of personalities, or the more subtle hypothesis of the *communicatio idiomatum*, between natures held to be inherently incompatible and exclusive. No! the incarnation is the Divine-Human taking upon itself the body that was prepared for it, the Word *becoming flesh*, as the inspired Prologue has it, and not *assuming human nature*, as our groping creeds are wont so confidently to express it.

The advantages here are apparent. All the speculative difficulties that have sprung up in the track of the Nicene formula, resulting in disastrous reactions against the divinity of Jesus, are in this way avoided; for we no more ask how a divine and a human soul can co-exist in the single personality of the suffering Messiah, or how the two natures can retain their distinctive attributes, while so thoroughly inosculating in the life and labors of the incarnate Son of Man. There are not two natures. There is but one, and that is the ideal humanity in accordance with which we were originally configured, and back to which this amazing condescension of the Logos was designed to lead us. We escape in this way the fatal extremes, upon which the hopes of earnest but adventurous spirits have too often struck and foundered. Exalting unduly the human nature of Jesus, and looking upon its physical union with the divine nature as an absolute contradiction in terms, Humanitarians have denied any distinctively theanthropic life in this greatest of prophets, or have been content to accept him literally as the first-born of every creature. He is divine, as all other men are divine, only with this dif-



ference that, as to the measure of his religious endowments, he has had no rival among the sons of men.

On the other hand, there is a class of theologians, whose minds are so deeply impressed with the displays of superhuman power in the life of Jesus, and the matchless beauty of his character, that they give themselves up to the divine element in his composition, conceived of as exclusive of the human, and insensibly withdraw him from the category of men, and make of him rather a theophany than God manifest in the flesh. In either case there is a false rendering of the person of Jesus and a falling short immeasurably of his glory. We want God to be near us, but not in a blinding apocalypse. He must not daze us with his untempered effulgence. He must come to us as the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, it is true, but lowly "and sitting upon an ass, and a colt the foal of an ass." He must have human sympathies, a love like our love, a pity like that which swells in our bosom, a loyalty to the eternal principles of righteousness and truth like that which we instinctively regard as the coronal of all human virtues. But then, also, the poles of his being must be in equipoise. He must not be too much God, or he will discourage the free intercourse of his froward children, nor too much man, lest there be not enough in him, to which they may anchor their faltering trust. Now upon the theory of a single theanthropic nature in Jesus, how easy to meet every essential condition of the problem. He is divine; he is human. He is not too divine to fellowship with us in our struggling estate, nor so human as not at the same time to be plenary divine. As Apollinaris has aptly said: "He is not so wholly what we are, as to be unable to make us what he is." The human in him is divine, and the divine in him is human, so that in making for himself a tabernacle among men, he did not take upon himself an alien and opposite nature, but simply narrowed his Divine Humanity to the circumscribed limits of a body of flesh and blood.

If it be objected that this is only shifting the difficulty without solving the problem; that it is just as impossible to con-



ceive of an infinite human nature *in transitu* to a finite form and conditions, as it is to conceive of the co-existence of opposite natures in the person of Jesus, we assent to the mystery, but it is an immeasurable gain in abstruse subjects like this, to have but one difficulty instead of two. On any hypothesis the infinite must become the finite in order that there be any real incarnation of God on the earth. This great insoluble mystery is that before which we all consent to bow and adore, but to add to it the speculative complication of the union of two opposite natures in the person of Christ, is to resolve one mystery by another darker even than the one it was intended to relieve. The view propounded has the signal advantage over all others, that it encounters no deeper mystery in the incarnation than that which philosophers consent to find in the material universe around them. Somehow the infinite has passed into the finite in the worlds that are teeming in space, without losing its fullness, or being in any way exhausted in the process. With the doctrine of the Logos, as applied to creation, we escape the "boundless inane" of pantheism, into which the philosophers have fallen; and, as applied to the incarnation, the pantheistic features of the Patripassian view, into which Mr Burris has fallen.

This is an aspect of the subject deserving our special attention. We have already seen how the theory of Mr. Burris reduces the humanity of Christ to the merest cipher, in the Trinity of what he is pleased to call the divine essentials in the person of Jesus. Having no root in the eternities, it is practically no essential at all. And, moreover, when he asserts that the infinite and inscrutable Deity assumed our human nature, when coming in the flesh, he evidently has no apprehension of the speculative clamors he has aroused. He does not even dream that it is necessary for him to define the human nature which the Deity is said to have assumed, that he may preclude the alternative of two souls in the personality of Jesus, or, what inevitably besets his theory, the preponderance of the divine element over the human, in Christ's composition, making his appearance after all but another theophany among men. But, as before intimated, by far the

most serious difficulty which Mr. Burris encounters, is the pantheistic features of his Patripassian view. Dr. Dorner strongly puts this objection: "If the Father himself is the immediate revealer—if there is no distinction in him, no Son through whom, as through his image, he reveals himself, first in himself and for himself, and then, also, in the world—then the object of revelation is lost, and its idea destroyed. For, if the Father, as the final ground, himself comes forth in revelation: and if, in order that the revelation may be complete, nothing can be left behind the ground; then did the Father, that is, God, pass over into and really become the world; and there is consequently nothing left but the world. This is the ethnical, pantheistic feature of Patripassianism and Sabellianism. The final result is to do away altogether with revelation; for, on the supposition referred to, that which was to be made manifest by revelation no longer exists." Unwittingly, Mr. Burris betrays a shadowy sense of the presence of this trouble, in the strangely confused, not to say, contradictory way in which he represents the divine Being as getting a habitation in the flesh. "In the Son," he says, "dwelt an *undivided* Deity." Again: "In the Son dwells a Deity *undivided* and *indivisible*, and through him, by God's own appointment, we have access unto the Father." Further on, however: "But, if the Son received his soul from God, did not God impart to him *a portion of his own divine nature*? We most unhesitatingly answer, he did. That which was begotten by him, and which is declared to be the express image of his person, could *only be a part of himself*. There was as much of God in Christ as could be confined of an infinite and omnipresent Being within any finite form. \* \* \* There was as much of that vast nature in the man Christ Jesus as could possibly be confined within such narrow limits. God is in every man, but in his Son was the fullness of God. \* \* \* Then is the Son God? If he derived his soul from Deity,—if God imparted to him *a part of his own divine nature*,—is he not *equally* divine?" A clear case of *non sequitur*, and an obvious struggle to throw off the pantheistic night-mare that sits so heavily on this school of

Christological thinking. "In the Son dwells an undivided Deity," and yet God has only "imparted to him a portion of his divine nature." "There was as much of that vast nature in the man Christ Jesus, as could possibly be confined within such narrow limits. God was in every man, but in his Son was the fulness of God,"—expressions absolutely incompatible and exclusive of one another. Indeed, with Mr. Burris, the man Jesus Christ dwindles to a condition of anomalous creatureship, as must be inferred from his protracted argument to show that, in himself, Jesus has none of the attributes of the Deity, venturing finally, upon the basis of Paul's very obscure passage concerning him, to affirm, "that while he is now subordinate to the Father, there is a time coming when his power and authority will be less than it is at present, and when he will become one of the subjects of the great and glorious kingdom of our God."

Mr. Goodwin's view is not so unstudied and immature. Here we are treated to a survey of the history of the doctrine, and we discover specifically the particulars in which the Monarchian Christology did not gain the suffrage of the church. Ignoring the Logos, it had no *rationale* of the central mystery of the Christian scheme. The indispensable *machina dei* was wanting, and men's minds were thrown upon the impossible task of conceiving the all of God embodied in the flesh. He must leave his eternities behind him to their abysmal emptiness, and sun and stars must roll on in orphanage for the absence of their Lord. He, the indivisible, has been born a man, and meantime his throne stands tenantless amid the deserted worlds. Mr. Burris attempts to storm this difficulty, by no stern grappling of logic, but by certain swelling phrases which blow boisterously round it, but leaves it as formidable as before. With Mr. Goodwin's conception of the Logos no such speculative trouble is encountered. The Logos is the Divine-human in the Deity. We thus get inseparably fixed to our conception of God a kind of anthropomorphism, without which we could have no intelligent apprehension of him at all.

The scientists of our day have raised a great hue and

cry over the Anthropomorphism of the Christian religion. With them this *sesquipedalian* is a synonym of superstition, the prolific mother of the grosser forms of *animism* that prevail among savages, and surviving in the higher stages of the religious life of the race, only because Science has not yet achieved the conquest of the subtler truths. The God of the *Savans* is a Deity of which we can predicate nothing, since every such predication has some human limitation attaching to it to render it false. But what if there be a humanity in God, in accordance with which our minds have been configured, and in the light of which our thinking of him must of necessity be conducted? Of course, in response to this, we must be prepared to hear the cry of "Mysticism!"—a stigma in the eyes of the New Philosophy quite as repellant as the grosser forms of religious superstition and cant. The great apostles of the new religion of science have the darling theory to maintain, that man is but the brute maturer grown; that, having made his way up, through natural selection, to his present exalted place in the scale of creation, from the burrowing troglodyte of the tropical jungles, he only shows his lack of science, when, accepting the legendary cosmology of Moses, he is drawn into the belief that, in some definite epoch in the past, God made him a man, and distinguished him by the direct impression of his divine image and likeness. They call the story of Genesis a dream, and yet this is precisely the primal fact to which the Bible men are determined to cling. The issue is clearly defined, and Mr. Goodwin is in no temper for compromise on this contested field. It is no effete doctrine; man was made in the image of God, and in this very particular was originally distinguished from the brute. The brute never can become this, because he has not the potency of this in him. The distinctively human in man is *not* the result of development, but is of a divine origin and quality, not simply because originally constituted of a higher grade than the animal, but because actually copied from the divine.

Mr. Goodwin makes this conception of man fundamental in his Christology. For if man be not a copy of the divine,

then the Divine-human is a myth, and his whole theory of the person of Christ an oriental dream. If God be the pantheistic All-Force, that the scientist thinks he is, differentiating itself in the worlds that cluster in space, and, furthermore, in the evolving forms of vegetable and animal life that spring up on the surface of the earth, then man came in only as the advanced term of a series, and with no marks of similitude to that All-Force, for of that All-Force no form can be affirmed. Here, then, is a species of anthropology which the devotees of the unknowable logically espouse, of such a character as to shut them away from any hearty acquiescence in the Christian scheme. Mr. Goodwin's book is remarkable as being fundamentally and boldly at issue with this whole school of materializing philosophers, planting its postulates not simply on God's Word,—since that might be disputed—but upon an obvious psychology, to which the concurrent wisdom of the past and the unbiased judgments of mankind easily yield their support. It deliberately constructs a system of rational anthropomorphism, which Christianity essentially is. How, without such a system, can men be reconciled to the stupendous fact of God manifest in the flesh. The incarnation was not an after-thought, an expedient thrust up in the economy of providence, to meet simply the emergency of sin. It has its roots in the divine nature, and in the constitution of man. We must so conceive it, or we leave the whole subject of Christology without any enduring basis in the eternal fitness of things. Liebner has echoed the earnest conviction of thousands, when he urges that, in two particulars, this whole subject awaits a revision. "*First*, we ought to cease advancing the idea that the ground of the incarnation was merely salvation from sin; and should look for a universal theanthropological basis; in other words, we should advance on to the knowledge that the incarnation of God stands in an original, essential, and necessary relation to humanity, and therefore to creation as its perfection. *Second*, we should try to arrive at such a unity of the Divine-

human Person as would render the sundering of the two factors an impossibility."

But the *Kenosis*—what of that? Thanks to Dr. Dorner for domesticating that word in our modern tongues. It was to be expected that Mr. Goodwin's argument would be put to the utmost strain of its capacity, when he should come to say in what way the Divine-human humbled himself to the creaturely experiences of flesh and blood. It is plain that Jesus was born a babe, was nourished by his mother through the helplessness of childhood, and flowered out into youth and manhood, through successive stages of expanding faculty, for aught that appears, precisely as in the case of any other man. He sorrowed and joyed like any other man. He was subject to hunger and weariness and pain. There were some things he confessed he did not know. He prayed for help, like the feeblest of those he came to redeem. He was not beyond the reach of his enemies, for notwithstanding the steady stream of supernatural power that incessantly issued from his person, he used none of it to lift himself out of the maelstrom of human passion into which his mission had thrust him, and which at last so ruthlessly swept him away. He was a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief; and the Apostle says he was tempted in all points as we are, yet without sin. Now the problem is, to determine how this single theanthropic nature could so part with its essential attributes, as to become the feeble, dependent, growing child of Nazareth, and the hunted, persecuted, crucified victim of the frenzied malice of the Jews. Granted that there are not two natures in him, but only one, and *that* the Divine-human nature, still, as to that nature he must be essentially the all-wise, all-powerful Deity that governs the universe; and then the question will be, how can this Deific One, Logos though he be, contract his infinite proportions, so as to make himself subject to the real experiences and limitations of our human estate in the flesh. It will be said, that the *pons asinorum* of all Christological thinking is just as impassable with this system, as with any other. But it should be borne in mind

that, specifically here, we are touching the dark point in the problem that every theory of the Person of Christ is intended to illumine;—how can Christ be real God and real man at the same time?

We have seen it somewhere stated that Mr. Goodwin fails in this part of his discussion. But now let us candidly inquire whether, in a region of spiritual thinking and insight so elevated, and into which our keenest dialectics can penetrate but a little distance, it is fair to conclude that a theory fails of its end, because it does not answer every objection that may be thrown in its way. Patience! I pray you; the lore of the skies is not learned in a day. Athanasius, whose influence was so great in settling the terms of the Nicene formula into what was conceived to be the inviolable fixedness of an orthodox standard, was wont to say: "The true Christ is incapable of being construed by the human reason." And Melancthon, who wrote so confidently in the Third Article of the Augsburg Confession, *ut sint duae naturae, divina et humana, in unitate personae inseparabiliter conjunctae, unus Christus, vere Deus et vere homo,*" when he came to die, comforted himself with the hope that, in the land whither he was going, he would "learn of what kind is the union of the two natures in Christ. We know in part. All views are but proximate, and we estimate their relative value in our experience, by the number of our speculative difficulties they are capable of setting aside. The supreme fact itself of the Logos manifest in the flesh rests upon the impregnable basis of the inspired Word of God, but the philosophy of that fact, its speculative development, should undoubtedly be left to the free and ever expanding religious consciousness of those to whom it is the palladium of their hopes.

And, now, is it any more difficult to conceive of the Divine-human becoming flesh, than it is that the eternal Logos should assume the finite, alien, human nature of man? Let us see. The current views, which, within certain limits, are varied enough to justify a wide margin of liberality in construction, are uniform, however, in holding to two natures in the Person of Christ, a divine and a human, an infinite and



a finite. Now the union of these two natures, in the complex personality of Jesus, is certainly more difficult to conceive, than is the baffling *Kenosis* of Mr. Goodwin's theory, with the obvious advantage in favor of Mr. Goodwin's theory, that it is in exact conformity to the scriptural phraseology on the subject. John says: "*καὶ ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο*"—the *Logos* became flesh; and by no means, the *Logos* assumed our human nature. So, also, Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians, ch. 2: 6—9, dealing more profoundly with the mystery, speaks of Christ in his pre-incarnate condition, as *ὃς ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπαρχων*—being in the form of God, *ἀλλ' ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσε*,—but as having emptied himself, and *μορφὴν δούλου λαβὼν*—as having taken upon himself the form of a servant, and being made in the likeness of men. That is to say, having been in the form of God in his pre-incarnate glory, he emptied himself, and passed into the form of a servant. The *Kenosis*, therefore, is not the assumption of another nature on the part of Jesus, but a change of form or condition in his own nature, whereby he limits or contracts himself to the real experiences of an unfolding human being in the flesh. How, we do not now ask; it is sufficient that the theory is posited in the exact terms of the apostle.

Turning again to the dual theory, we find ourselves confounded by the very unphilosophical distinction which is drawn between a *nature* and a *person*. Doubtless there is a valid distinction of that kind; but to make the severance so absolute as to shut away the divine nature from participation in the obedience and suffering of Jesus, and make such obedience and suffering an experience of the divine person only, is not to distinguish but to divide, if it is not the merest trick of theological legerdemain. Yet this is precisely what Dr. Hodge does in his *System of Theology*, when he says: "Although the divine nature is immutable and impassible, and, therefore, neither the obedience nor suffering of Christ was the obedience or suffering of the divine nature, yet they were none the less the obedience and suffering of a divine person." So then, the divine nature did not suffer, but only the divine person. Meantime what was the person of Jesus, human or



divine? If divine, then exactly the same obstacles would lie in the way of having the person share in the human sufferings of Jesus, as would embarrass the divine nature in direct participation with the human. Such severance of the divine nature and person of Jesus is a metaphysical fiction.

Or, if we hold with Mr. Liddon, in his Bampton Lectures, that Christ's "single personality had *two different spheres* in which it operated, a divine and a human sphere; in the one of which it was all-blessed, undying, and omniscient; in the other, subject to pain of mind and body, with actual death, and a corresponding liability to a limitation of knowledge"—alas! then how much sane logic have we left. Here is a person, divine we must assume, thinking and acting in two eternally opposite spheres of consciousness at one and the same time. Now, if there is any proposition of which we can be certain, it is, that unity of consciousness is absolutely indispensable to unity of personality. But, on this hypothesis, Christ has two self-consciousnesses in his single personality, making Him who should be our elder brother a most confounding anomaly, beside tormenting us with the unthinkable proposition of two egos having an equal share in a third, and altogether constituting the one person who was said to be made in the likeness of men.

Recently the speculation has been advanced by prominent German theologians, that the divine Second Person of the Trinity surrendered his distinctive attributes to the other two Persons, while he entered himself into the limitations of our estate. In the words of one of our own divines, advocating this view: "One of these Persons only, the Divine Word, became subject to the law of incarnation, and the consequent human experiences, whilst the other Persons of the Godhead held and acted his divine attributes during the period of this subjection." There is a glimpse of the *Kenosis* in this direction. But the difficulties are insuperable. How could the Logos resign his attributes to the other two Persons of the Godhead, when they, by supposition, already possessed those attributes in common with him? Impossible! unless the hypostasis is so grossly conceived as to make, not a Trinity,

but a Tritheism out of the three Persons. And, then, how impossible the conception that any spiritual being should relegate his attributes to another; and if this were possible in a divine being, still in the case under consideration, he that enters the flesh, not being divine-human in his nature, when he yields his attributes, what of the Logos would be left to constitute a veritable incarnation of God on the earth? His divine attributes are gone, and the discovery of a divine-human in his composition has not yet been made. There cannot, therefore, be any divine humbling or *self-emptying* in the case, because, in the impossible transaction of yielding up his divine prerogatives to another, the Second Person of the Godhead does not *forego*, but actually *loses*, himself in the flesh. Just at this point we have the opportunity of, at least, seeing definitely what Mr. Goodwin means by the *Kenosis*.

The term, derived from Paul's language in Philippians—*ἐαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν*, means simply a self-emptying, or *self-limitation of the Son in the incarnation*. Observe, first, concerning it, that it can logically have no place in the incarnation except upon the theory of a divine-human in the Logos, such as Mr. Goodwin has broached. Being in the *form of God*, the Logos assumed the *form of a man*. Certainly in the view of Dr. Hodge, no self-emptying is possible. A divine Person assumes the human nature, but keeps the divine nature aloof, so that "neither the obedience nor suffering of Christ was the obedience or suffering of the divine nature, &c." Now it is impossible that the reason of man, or his most elevated experiences, can be satisfied with any such construction of the Person of Christ. In Christ the divine nature must share the limitations and sufferings of one estate. Paul figures this to his mind in the *Kenosis*. The incarnation must be a real entrance of the divine Being into the corporate history of the race, and this cannot be done if the divine nature is kept aloof. So, therefore,—let us reverently hold it—the infinite God must humble himself to such an extent as to be in self-sacrifice with his erring creatures.

Looking carefully and dispassionately at the current views, we can see no room for this, either in the theory of the union

of two souls, or of two incongruous natures in the Person of Christ. The divine Being does not *empty* himself on either assumption, for he is represented as becoming incarnate in the plenitude of his personality, only keeping his divine nature aloof from the sufferings and subjection in which his human nature is involved. We struggle here with the unwelcome conclusion that a sacrifice in which the divine feeling does not participate cannot, in the nature of the case, have any higher value attaching to it than what can be measured by purely human standards.

To relieve this difficulty, the Lutheran theologians have advanced a long way on the Chalcedon Symbol in their distinguishing doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*. They teach that the divine Son of God "when the time was fulfilled assumed human nature also in unity of his person, not in such a manner as to become two persons or two Christs, but Jesus Christ now in one person;" that "these two natures in the person of Christ are never separated or commingled with each other, nor changed into one another;" and that they "are so united as to have a real communion with each other," that, "on account of this real communion of natures, not the bare human nature suffered for the sins of the world, but the Son of God himself suffered truly, *only according to his human nature* ; as the Apostolic Symbol testifies, he died truly, although the divine nature can neither suffer nor die." The ingenuity of this reason is strongly abetted by the fact, that it is a commendable effort in the right direction ; but it is entirely too subtle to be heartily accepted without some psychology that will give it a basis in reason. Being a purely speculative development of the great fact of the manifestation of the divine Logos in the flesh, it can claim no peculiar exemption from the decisions of speculative standards. We must note, therefore, first, the difficulty of conceiving of two natures in one person, never separated yet never commingling. And then, mainly, we are pressed with the inquiry, how Christ could suffer *according to his human nature*, and not at the same time according to his divine nature, in a case where the two natures, by assumption, have

such a real communion with each other; and if he did, what meaning there would be in the superfluous presence of the divine nature in circumstances where its offices were not needed. What is the purpose of the *communicatio idiomatum*, but to secure the one set of attributes in full sympathy and predicament with the other set? And yet if Christ must suffer according to his human nature, and be untouched as to his divine nature, the purpose of the *real communion* is practically lost; it is asserting in words what subsequently is denied in fact. The end of the theory, to wit, to have the dual nature of Christ so blended in the unity of his person that, somehow, his divine nature shall be implicated in his sufferings and death on the cross, is virtually defeated, by the scholastic notion of the *impassibility* of God. The incarnation is God entering himself into visible suffering with the race, to signify, in this way, the eternal self-sacrifice which makes up the very heart of his love. If, however, he be *impassible* the whole thing is a gloss. He came to reveal his suffering love; but how thoroughly the whole scheme is defeated, if there be no suffering love to reveal. It is this maxim that tortures the *communicatio idiomatum* into such opposite statements—two natures inseparable, yet unmixed—not the bare human nature suffering for the sins of the world, but the Son of God suffering truly, only according to his human nature, since the divine nature can neither suffer nor die.

Turning again to Mr. Goodwin, we find him seeking a solid basis for his theory in an anthropological scheme, which is venerable for its antiquity, and to which the richest results of psychological inquiry in all ages of the world have paid willing tribute. It is Paul's analysis of the human organization and powers into *πνεῦμα*, *ψυχή*, and *σῶμα* (1 Thess. 5: 23), the *pneuma* representing that element in the human trichotomy which is not derived from the race, but is so far above the entanglements of the flesh that it is not propagated with the body according to physical laws, but is an immediate creation of God. The *psyche*, however, shares the fortunes of the body, and is the limiting environment in accord-

ance with which the *pneuma* comes into exercise in a world of sense. This is the constitution of all men; and on the assumption that Jesus was the archetype, how utterly improbable that, in his incarnate manifestation, he should essentially diverge from the pattern which he himself was. When he *becomes man*, there is no such psychological enigma in his composition as the current opinions would have us believe. He has a divine Father, and a human mother, for what end, save that the *pneuma* portion of the man Jesus might be the plenary indwelling of the divine Logos himself, while from the mother he would receive what every other man receives from the race, in the ordinary process of human generation, to wit, a fleshly body and an animal mind. Thus that *pneuma* is new-conditioned in its development. It has assumed, not our human nature, unless that expression be held strictly to its technical import, but a fleshly body and its animal mind; and is, therefore, in that act committed to such processes of finite experience and unfolding, such laws of growth and curtailments of faculty as the *psyche* and *soma* must impose.

Dimly, it may be, yet with a satisfaction which no other view of the person of Christ has conferred, we begin to see what the process of *self-emptying* was of which the Apostle speaks. The Divine entering the flesh, must, for a time, compromise his physical attributes, though his divine-human attributes he can never forego. They are perennially there, making his flesh lustrous, and his person radiant, as on the Mount of Transfiguration. Fully conscious must we all be that there is a point in this mystery beyond which it is not permitted to go, a borderland, where in the gloaming of impenetrable shadows, the insatiable quest of the eye is arrested by a bramble-bush aflame in the presence of which we unsandal our feet, and hush our spirits into silent awe. How the Logos could lay aside his physical attributes and retain his divine-human ones Mr. Goodwin does not assume to say. The facts of the incarnate ministry absolutely pre-suppose the process, but how it could be the intellect of man will

probably never be able to fathom. Here every devout inquirer uncovers head. Happy is he, who, amid the subtleties of the most untrammelled search, may evermore find his horizon aglow with John's Angel standing in the Sun.

---

NOTE.—It is deemed due, alike to the author of the preceding article, and to the REVIEW, to say that he generously volunteered the adding of a *note* of explanation by the Editor. As the views advocated diverge from the doctrine of the Person of Christ as set forth in ecclesiastical symbols and generally held by the Church, the author of the article desires to "assume the responsibility of whatever divergence there may be in it from the accepted standards, and hopes that it may be read in the spirit in which it was written." Whilst dissenting from the peculiar view of Mr. Goodwin, and here maintained by our reviewer, the general tone of the article is so elevated and Christian, and the errors of Mr. Burris and others are so ably exposed, we have not hesitated to give it a place in the REVIEW. It is believed that the discussion will do good service by drawing attention to this great central doctrine of the Christian system, and by exposing some of the very shallow views that some would substitute for the great mystery of godliness. If Prof. Wynn has not succeeded in showing "a more excellent way" of conceiving of this great mystery, he has at least furnished matter for sober thought to many who make little account of it. We do not propose to discuss the article or even to state what we conceive insuperable difficulties to Mr. Goodwin's theory. We only ask for it a careful reading in the spirit asked for by the writer of it.—ED.

## ARTICLE II.

## THE COSMOLOGY OF PARADISE LOST.

By JOHN A. HIMES, A. M., Professor of English Literature in Pennsylvania College.

Little observation is needed to convince one of the fact that Milton is much less read than his acknowledged pre-eminence among poets would lead us to anticipate. In a library of no more than three or four books, we should, on account of the universal interest of the subject treated as well as the reputation of its author, look for a copy of *Paradise Lost*. In other words, we would think an acquaintance with Milton a necessary part of the most rudimentary education. One of our best known American scholars, now venerable for the experience of three quarters of a century, once told his pupils that he had, before entering college at sixteen, read through *Paradise Lost* seven times; but instances of a similar appreciation of it among the young are now extremely rare. Of those who read the first two books of the poem, probably not one-fourth persevere through the twelve. Still fewer return to it for a second perusal, or readily understand references to its minor incidents. Even where it is studied in the schools, as far as I can learn, so little is done for the most part to impress the pupil with the true greatness of the work that he remembers it, in after years, rather as a book of involved sentences for "parsing" than as a poem of unequalled grandeur.

Much of the want of interest in *Paradise Lost* doubtless comes from what some have been pleased to style Milton's indefiniteness, but which is really a failure on the part of his readers to recognize the system of the universe adopted by the poet as the basis of his epic. No critic of Milton has ever done more to aid intelligent study of this poem than Professor David Masson, of Edinburgh University, by means of his simple diagram of the universe as it lay in the imagin-



ation of the poet. The charges of vagueness so often brought against Milton are seen to be without foundation, as it is discovered how he has constructed his universe upon a definite plan and with strictly mathematical proportions. The errors and oversights of eminent scholars with reference to what is contained in the poem, prove either a reprehensible neglect or a strangely superficial study of this epic which is the pride of our language. It is my purpose in this article, while adopting the scheme of Professor Masson, to add such results of my own study as may prove helpful to students of this important work. If some of the conclusions should seem to be based upon inadequate foundations, let it be remembered that a great poet is likely to have, and, indeed, for purposes of invention must have, in his work, a more pervading system than may at once appear; that in his mind, perfectly acquainted with his materials, are connected things which ordinary readers would never think of associating together; and that often the only indications of such a system are in obscure and scattered hints.

Milton, having assumed infinite space as the theatre of the events which he describes, divides it previous to the angelic rebellion between the Empyrean, or Heaven, and Chaos. If we represent as included within a circle that infinity which is, in reality, boundless, and then draw a horizontal diameter to this circle, the upper half will represent the Empyrean, the lower half Chaos, and the diameter itself the wall between the two.\* After the rebellion of Satan and his followers, there was a modification of a remote portion of Chaos, and the rebels were enclosed within it by a wall;† a gate on the side towards Heaven was locked against their egress.

---

\* It is scarcely necessary to caution the reader that we are here dealing, in reality, not with a plane surface, but with a sphere; and that the diagram is drawn in the manner described for the sake of greater simplicity.

† This may be represented in the diagram by dividing the lowest portion of Chaos from the remainder by a curved line bending upwards, giving Hell something of the shape of a section of a double convex lens.



Presently there was another modification of Chaos, when the act of Creation described in Genesis took place. A spherical portion of Chaos, with a radius equal to one-third of the distance between the Empyrean and Hell, was cut off from that part of the hoary Deep nearest the Empyrean, by a wall within which were created the Earth, Sun, Moon and Stars. We thus have the universe divided into four distinct parts—the Empyrean, Chaos, Hell and the World. It will be easy, from these few directions, for any one who may not have Professor Masson's diagram at hand, to construct one for himself; and it will be a great assistance to the reader of *Paradise Lost* to keep it continually before him.

As we proceed more fully to consider separately each of the four divisions of the universe, it will be convenient for us to follow the poet's order of progress, and to contemplate first those "regions of sorrow" described in the beginning of the poem. Hell is a place of punishment; but Milton does not exercise his ingenuity in originating modes of torture for the wicked, as Dante has done in the construction of his *Inferno*, beginning with the stinging of gad-flies and ending in the lowest circle with the crunching of sinners between the teeth of the Emperor himself of the "kingdom dolorous." Though Milton never shocks us with such atrocities, yet to heighten our horror of those doleful shades, he indicates a considerable variety of punishment for the rebellious. For instance, it was thought in Homeric times that the Olympic deities could suffer physical hurt; and it was likewise the belief in later, Christian times, as a passage in Rabelais asserts, that "though devils cannot be killed, they may suffer a solution of continuity." In accordance with this precedent, Milton has exhibited the fallen spirits as enduring the most exquisite physical torture, being subjected, by turns, to fierce extremes of heat and cold. For nine days after their fall from Heaven, they lay upon the burning lake, but, we are expressly informed, that they are driven at certain intervals to a far-off, "frozen continent,"

"From beds of raging fire to starve in ice  
Their soft ethereal warmth."

They are likewise subjected to a peculiarly fitting sort of retribution, by which whatever mischief they invent against others is likely to recoil upon themselves, and make their own condition less tolerable. A notable instance of this is found in the tenth book; where, after his return from the temptation of man, Satan is about to relate his triumph, and he and all his followers are in a moment changed into serpents, and driven by hunger and thirst to eat apples that are ashes to their taste. They are punished chiefly, however, in their intellectual nature, to show the hollowness of that proud boast of Satan:—

“The mind is its own place, and, in itself,  
Can make a heaven of Hell, a hell of Heaven.”

They had scorned the truth as they knew it in Heaven; and now doubts and painful speculations, such as either never engaged the thoughts of celestial beings, or were easily settled, began to fill their minds. Their intellectual pride was humbled by the result of their eloquent reasoning on “providence, foreknowledge, will and fate;” they reached no fundamental truth, and “found no end, in wandering mazes lost.” Their most acute and subtle arguments on subjects of most intimate interest mocked them with the uselessness of “vain wisdom and false philosophy.” They are further punished in their spiritual natures by an enforced remembrance of their previous condition, their fall and terrible humiliation. The river of Oblivion winds through their territory, but they dare not drink and forget their misery. The uncertainty of their condition makes them subject to fears, which are kept alive and augmented by the sights and sounds of that dismal realm,

“Where nature breeds,  
Perverse, all monstrous, all prodigious things,  
Abominable, inutterable, and worse  
Than fables yet have feigned or fear conceived,  
Gorgons, and Hydras, and Chimaeras dire.”

Homer, Virgil and Dante have all imagined the place of punishment for the wicked to be within the Earth itself.

Milton in one line alludes to a tradition of this kind (xii, 41); but we are not at liberty from this to suppose either that he accepted the notion of his predecessors, or that he meant to suggest a second Hell within the Earth, after the fiends had escaped from their original dungeon. Milton's conception of the place of all evil is immeasurably grander and larger than that of a region bounded by the crust of the Earth. Every portion of the description impresses us with vastness. The fiery gulf on which Satan and his legions lay entranced extended on every side as far as eye could reach; and no human eye could have measured such distance, for the burning lake appeared shoreless even to "angel's ken." The burning lake, vast as it is, is by no means the whole of Hell. After a long flight Satan can stand on the border of that lake upon land that burns with "solid fire." A wide volcanic belt surrounds the "inflamed sea," as similar belts, though less in extent and power, fringe our earthly oceans. Over this the fallen spirits follow their leader, with painful steps, first over the "burning marle," and then over the "burnt soil." It is important to observe the use, first of the present, and afterwards of the past participle, to indicate the progress of the host away from the burning centre. On the margin of the burnt district is built Pandemonium, probably as near the centre of the whole region as circumstances will permit. The dimensions of Satan's capitol are in keeping with those of the realm; there is room for a thousand of the great Seraphic Lords in undiminished size to sit in secret conclave; then a spacious hall, "like a covered field," to receive the unnumbered inferior leaders reduced in size to less than smallest dwarfs; but no space at all within for the untitled or common. At first, there is only the single structure in which the infernal council is held, but at Satan's return from the World, it has grown into a metropolis, a city with walls. About it, there is space for all the occupations of the infernal host—there are plains for the games, races and feats of arms, secluded valleys for the melancholy bards among those fallen spirits, hills for the resort of the eloquent and philosophical.

The exploring expeditions of adventurous bands in four directions give the poet additional opportunity for showing his readers the almost infinite extent, as well as the multitudinous forms of desolation, of this prison of the lost. The routes lie along the banks of four infernal rivers, that from different directions discharge into the central lake. Everything is on the largest scale. Even as angels march, it is *far* to the slow and silent waters of Lethe. This stream ought itself, in order to preserve proper proportions, to be like the "ocean stream" in extent; and the terms, "flood," "ford," "sound," used to designate it, allow this supposition. The name "labyrinth" need not refer to any intricate windings of the stream, but may be descriptive of a simple circular form, as later, in line 183 of the ninth book. The words, "frozen continent," describing what lies beyond, may be regarded as indicating either the vastness of the region, or "continent" (*contineo*, to contain,) may be used to define its place and shape as enclosing the rest, or, as is very probable, both ideas may be combined in the expression. Having described the most striking single features of the realm of darkness, the poet makes a summary of the terrible desolations in a single masterly sentence:—

"Through many a dark and dreary vale  
They passed, and many a region dolorous,  
O'er many a frozen, many a fiery Alp,  
Rocks, caves, lakes, fens, bogs, dens, and shades of death—  
A universe of death."

On account of the monotony of gloom and woeful sights, we are liable to forget the magnitude of the whole region, unless we look carefully at each particular part of the description, remembering especially that all these things are so impressive not to men, exhausted by a journey of a few miles, but to angels, of strength and swiftness transcending our imagination. Reviewing what has been said, unless, then, we are drawing our conclusions too hastily, this realm of evil is divided by concentric circles into four parts consigned, respectively, to the four elements of ancient physics, that in Chaos appear as four warring champions,—Hot, Dry, Moist and

Cold. The first, or central region is distinguished for destructive heat; the second, for desolating dryness; the third, for a barren waste of water that will not relieve thirst; the fourth, for stiffening cold. The four champions, here no longer struggling with each other, can bring in turn all their malignant force to bear upon the denizens of Hell. Should this apparent scheme of the poet be accepted as a real one, the region must be regarded as not so absolutely "fenceless," "vague" and "indefinite" as has been supposed by Ruskin (*Mod. Paint.* Vol. III. 215).

The long, solitary flight of Satan, chiefly in a vertical course, proves vastness of extent in a fifth direction. Following his adventures will henceforward best acquaint us with the portions of the universe through which he passes. Two allegorical Shapes, Sin and Death, permit Satan's transit from his prison into Chaos by gates which, when opened, are wide enough for the passage of an army with extended wings and displayed banners. This division of the universe has negative characteristics; Hell has positive. In this, there has simply been an absence of creative power; in Hell, there had been a direct exercise of that power to create a place of evil. In Chaos, matter is in its primitive condition without the impress of Divine law and order; in Hell, it is made to subserve the purpose of punishment for the rebellious. In Chaos, the elements exist unorganized and out of harmony with each other; and they are so devoid of the properties which we are accustomed always to associate with them that nothing with reference to them can be foreseen or provided against. Besides, the poet imagines the diffusion through Chaos of certain "black, tartareous, cold, infernal dregs, adverse to life," which had been purged out of the World and probably more collected together in Hell (VII. 238). Hence the mishaps of Satan's passage, his fall through vacuity, the rebuff from a nitrous cloud, the perilous struggle through a "boggy Syrtis," and countless unnamed difficulties. The throne and court of the allegorical Anarch of the Abyss are the most confused, noisy and tumultuous por-

tion of Chaos; and are not, as we would anticipate, established in the interior, but on the frontier, in order more easily to defend his possessions against further encroachments.\* The reason here given for such a location of the throne would seem sufficient, if the *fact* were established upon a different basis, but scarcely of importance enough in itself to warrant a departure from so pronounced a rule as that requiring the seat of government of a country to be in the interior. Why, then, does the poet so expressly put the dark pavilion of Chaos and old Night so near the light of Heaven? Is it not in obscure allusion to the very popular notion that the darkest hour is just before the dawn?

With regard to the extent and the relations of this region to the others, it is rightly said to be "without bound, without dimension," but only in two directions. The breadth of it between Hell and the Empyrean is accurately determined; it is three semi-diameters of the World or Starry Universe. In other words, this Starry Universe, which had been created between the time of Satan's fall and that of his return, extends two-thirds of the distance between the Empyrean and Hell; and when Satan issued from Hell-gates, had not his vision been obstructed by the materials of Chaos, it would have subtended an arc of more than sixty degrees directly over head in his field of view. Satan's flight through Chaos was not in a straight line, since he was obliged to enter the World from its upper side, but bent far to the left of the new creation. The Empyrean, if not rendered invisible by the same confused medium, from whatever point of Chaos viewed, would have seemed like a sky meeting the "hoary Deep" on the horizon. Intimately connected with this, there is, at the close of the second book, a passage requiring explanation. As Satan emerges from the night of Chaos, and the difficulty of his journey is much diminished, he has

---

\* Prof Masson makes a very natural oversight in connection with this, saying of Satan on his way through Chaos: "He reaches at length, about *midway* in his journey, the *central* throne and pavilion where Chaos personified and Night have their government." (See his Introduction to *Paradise Lost*).

“Leisure to behold  
 Far off the Empyrean Heaven, extended wide  
 In circuit, undetermined square or round,  
 With opal towers and battlements adorned  
 Of living sapphire, once his native seat,  
 And, fast by, hanging in a golden chain,  
 This pendent World, in bigness as a star  
 Of smallest magnitude close by the moon.”

Is it possible that Milton has forgotten the proportions of his Universe, and that near the end of the journey Satan is still supposed to be at that inconceivably distant point, where, as Tennyson says,

“All the starry heavens of space  
 Are sharpened to a needle’s end” ?

To this question Professor Masson replies: “It may well be asked how the World could have appeared to him (Satan) only as a ‘star of smallest magnitude.’ My answer would be that it is not necessary either for poetical consistency, or for the syntax of the passage to suppose that Milton meant to reproduce the exact optical effect as witnessed by Satan himself. There may be a change of thought by which Milton referring freely to his own imagined diagram, reminds his readers of the facts of that diagram in connection with the sight which Satan beheld. Above him, far off, he beheld the under-surface of the Empyrean, extended so wide that its figure could not be determined; and from that under-surface he saw our World depending—which World of ours in proportion to the Empyrean from which it hangs is but ‘as a star of smallest magnitude close by the moon.’ This idea seems to be confirmed by III. 422-423, where Milton resuming the story says:—‘A *globe* far off it seemed; now seems a boundless continent.’” \*

It is necessary here to guard against a very common error. Addison fell into it, supposing that Satan at this stage of his progress saw our “Earth that hung close by the moon”

---

\* From a private letter to the writer of this article.



(Spectator, 309). A century and a half later this delusion is not yet universally abandoned; and one as eminent as Addison quotes the passage referred to in a connection that shows him to have made the same mistake (Longfellow: Notes to Dante's *Divine Comedy*, Paradiso xxii. 135). The author of *Parish Astronomy* manifests the same misapprehension when he speaks of Milton's use of poetic license in hanging "one orb at least by a golden chain" (*Ecce Coelum*, p. 40). After what has been said, it scarcely needs to be more distinctly affirmed that this golden chain—which is possibly meant to signify nothing more than the distant appearance of the lighted passage way between the Empyrean and the World beneath—supports our whole Starry Universe. What Satan saw depending from the Empyrean is the wall of this Universe assaulted by the tempests of Chaos and protecting within itself in peace and order the circling Orbs of the new creation. In this peaceful harbor are sheltered not only all the bodies of our solar system, but every other star and cluster and system within the grasp of the most powerful telescope, and all the vast interstellar spaces which light traverses only in millions of years. A contemplation of this fact is sufficient to astonish us at the length of the measuring line used by Milton—"From the centre to the utmost pole." The journey just accomplished by Satan must have been at least four times this distance.

Where Satan alights on the wall of the Starry Universe, Milton has supposed to be what he calls the Limbo of Vanity, or Paradise of Fools. Dante's Limbo was the outermost circle of the Inferno, and in it were placed only those who had lived well according to the light of nature, but were unbaptized. It may be questioned whether the critics are right in calling this Paradise of Fools a purely allegorical region intended for a particular class of men and their works, distinguished for nonsense and vain enthusiasm, and whether it is not designed as the place where all the finally impenitent of the human family pass what theologians call the "intermediate state," from the time of their earthly dissolution



to that of their eternal condemnation.\* Their final destination is not Limbo, but the infernal Pit. Soon after the Fall of man, the fiends desert Hell and take up their residence in the newly conquered Universe; and it is not to be imagined that, for the time, the lost of the human race are the only occupants of the place of punishment. It is true that the examples given of such as find their way to this Limbo are taken chiefly from those whose works are characterized as foolish rather than sinful; but the language is, when carefully examined, very general, including

"All who in vain things  
Built their fond hopes of glory, or lasting fame,  
Or happiness in this or the other life;  
All who have their reward on earth," &c.

The spirits of the righteous dead, on the other hand, obtain possession of the Moon's argent fields, or are wafted across the Crystalline Sea into Heaven itself.

When Satan reached the upper side of the dark wall surrounding the Universe, he saw the gate of Heaven, the stairs leading up from the Universe, and the passage to the Earth. Looking into the Universe, he saw, as the most magnificent object, the Sun of our system. Whether Satan is supposed to have seen the Earth at all from this opening is doubtful: Raphael saw it afterward from the same spot, and the Garden of God upon it, but the vision of Satan since his fall had been rendered less acute, and he manifestly could distinguish less clearly than could Raphael. Satan, therefore, directs his course first to the Sun, passing on his route innumerable stars, that seemed stars at a distance, but near at hand were discovered to be other worlds. Raphael, too, on his visit to the Earth, "sails between worlds and worlds;" proving that though Milton's knowledge of the Universe was less than is ours, he still had some idea of its grandeur and vastness as disclosed by modern science. From the Sun Satan is directed to the Earth.

---

\* Compare III. 457, 458—

"Dissolved on Earth, fleet hither, and in vain  
Till final dissolution, wander here."

It is expressly stated that the bodies of this protected Universe were formed from materials originally in the same condition as those now in Chaos, and that the remainder of the matter that had occupied the inner space went to make the wall about these orbs, or was cast downward as refuse. Within the World the warring elements of Chaos have been reduced to order and use by the act of Creation. While concord and beauty have been evolved out of the chaotic materials everywhere, in all the multitudinous orbs of this Universe, there is one that seems to have a superiority over the others. Matter appears to find its ultimate perfection in gold, precious stones, pure, life-giving liquids, and clear, delicious air in the Sun. Here, the poet fancies, are the philosopher's stone, the elixir vitae, the aurum potabile—those ideal substances so long sought after by the toiling alchemists.

It is a task of no little difficulty to determine precisely what system of the Universe was adopted by Milton, because there is evident a continual struggle between his reason and scientific knowledge on one side, and his poetic necessities on the other. Notwithstanding the teachings of Copernicus, notwithstanding the bold testimony and brave sufferings of Galileo, the amended Ptolemaic, or Alphonsine system, still, two centuries ago, controlled the opinions of men. The language of Scripture seemed to favor it. All the old poetic associations clustered about it, and some of them, such as the "Music of the Spheres," were great favorites with Milton. Accordingly he constructed his Universe with the Earth at the centre, (VII. 242; IX. 108) and the ten Spheres of the Alphonsine system circling about it. The Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Spheres, viz., that of the Fixed Stars, the Crystalline and the Primum Mobile, are separately mentioned at one or more places in the poem; and the whole ten Spheres are once enumerated in their proper order. Spirits attempting to rise from Earth to Heaven are said to go through these successive stages:

"They pass the Planets Seven, and pass the Fixed,  
And that Crystalline Sphere, whose balance weighs  
The trepidation talked, and that First Moved."

The poet, however, does not manifest much confidence in the system which he is, as it were, obliged to adopt. The very lines which we have quoted are found in connection with ideas so grotesque, that we are scarcely certain whether he does not mean to burlesque the system so jealously guarded by a superstitious church. It is hardly imaginable that he was serious in the succeeding line in which Peter appears as the warder of Heaven's gate. The poet seems to be well acquainted with the weak points of the old system, with the inconceivable velocity required of the outer Orbs, and especially with the complexity of the scheme. Raphael speaks to Adam of the amusement it would cause in Heaven to witness the theories of men—

"How they will wield  
The mighty frame ; how build, unbuild, contrive  
To save appearances ; how gird the Sphere  
With Centric and Eccentric scribbled o'er,  
Cycle and Epicycle, Orb in Orb."

Where the Ptolemaic system is directly compared with the Copernican, the balance of evidence is always favorable to the latter. All this is what we should expect from Milton's independence of thought, from his friendship with Galileo, and his natural revulsion from the doctrines of a bigoted and persecuting church.

The last evidence necessary to be mentioned of Milton's divorcement from the old system is found in the position assigned by him to the Empyrean. The Primum Mobile loses half its meaning when the fixed Heaven of pure flame, imagined as enclosing it, is removed. According to the old scheme, the Ninth Sphere (the Tenth in the Alphonsine System) was entirely surrounded by the Empyrean, and thus, though not the first heaven from the outside, was the "first moved." Milton, on the other hand, has enveloped the wall of his Starry Universe with Chaos, and has imagined the Empyrean to be entirely above the World. The necessity of fixing boundaries to what is, in reality, boundless, in order to bring it better within comprehension of our limited faculties, has caused the poet to speak of the Empyrean as having shape—

"square or round." Later in the poem (x. 381) it is spoken of as a "quadrature."

The Empyrean is less particularly described than the other divisions of universal space; but it has, we are told, the same variety of scenery as our Earth—mountains with rivers, rocks and woods; wide planes—wider than the whole Earth—for angelic camping-grounds; gentle vales with shade and fountains and arbours, where the Sons of Light may sit "in fellowships of joy." The whole is divided into regencies of vast extent and presided over by Seraphim and Potentates and Thrones. Upon a lofty mountain in the centre of the Empyrean is the seat of Divinity, whence the Almighty Father overlooks and rules not only the Empyrean and the World, but also Chaos and Hell. On a smaller elevation in the North Satan had his seat; his power and ambition (not at first a sinful desire of pre-eminence) being indicated by the loftiness and magnificence of his royal palace. Besides these two prominent land-marks, and the River of Life there is little direct specification of objects in Heaven. Perhaps less was needed, because we are told that before the marring of it by Satan the Starry Universe was like Heaven, scarcely, if at all, inferior, because a similar example of Divine creative art. What matter, then, if Heaven's glories are rivaled by a sunset viewed from Paradise? Did not the poet's reason tell him that it would be folly for human fancy to attempt the creation of an ideal world better and more beautiful than this before sin entered? Accordingly we find the same general features in Milton's Heaven as in his Paradise, the poet in this way adding his own testimony to that of the Divine Word, that the new creation was "very good."

Milton was far from turning his Heaven into a Turkish paradise. He never forgot the fact that it is the home of immortal happy spirits, that what is material there is subordinate in importance, and a mere servant to high and beautiful thoughts. There the immaterial asserts its dignity; the immortal mind is supreme; ideas and principles rule. We hear, indeed, of one who admired more

"The riches of Heaven's pavement, trodden gold,  
Than aught divine or holy else, enjoyed  
In vision beatific,"

but he was cast with the ungodly crew into Hell. Though the material prospects are all in harmony with the intellectual bliss, yet reason, affection and lofty contemplation are chief in Heaven. There is a greater independence of physical conditions among the inhabitants of Heaven than among those of Earth or Hell. Doubtless, of the unfallen it was true that they could "make a heaven of Hell." Raphael and his legion of angelic followers certainly did not experience such discomfort in their expedition through Chaos on the sixth day of Creation (VIII. 230) as did Satan shortly after. The rebellious, from the time of their struggle in Heaven, became grosser and more subject to material influences, liable to pain, weaker in intellect and sense. Notwithstanding this, even after their fall they remained intellectually mighty, rose superior to their evil circumstances, and found satisfaction in speculation, though racked with physical pain. Man in Paradise, composed of body as well as soul, was from the first more subject to material limitations, and they were increased after his disobedience, so that he no longer as clearly discerned his angelic visitors. A good illustration of this may be found by comparing the advent to Adam of Raphael with that of Michael (XI. 211, 212).

Proceeding upon this postulate of lofty intellectuality in the inhabitants of Heaven, Milton might easily in his description dispense with those luxurious and gorgeous displays, capable chiefly of gratifying the grosser human sense. The poet seems consciously and purposely to have aimed at illustrating the eternal exaltation of spirit above mere matter and force. In accordance with this, Heaven is more filled with rapture at the announcement of Messiah's purpose to restore fallen man than at his return in a triumphal chariot from victory over his foes. An application of this principle will sometimes supply a satisfactory explanation to passages otherwise dark and mysterious. Take an instance from the close

of the fourth book. James Montgomery complains that the interview between Gabriel and Satan ends unsatisfactorily; and Dr. Johnson likewise considers it a serious defect in the poem that when "Satan is with great expectation brought before Gabriel in Paradise, he is suffered to go away unmolested." With all deference to these distinguished critics, we prefer to regard the incident an example of Milton's sublime daring, and an excellence of the highest order. Physical force is properly regarded as an ignoble means of attaining an end even among cultured men; and it is easily conceivable that beings of the angelic kind, possessed of more foresight, are much more controlled by ideas, principles or judgments than are human beings. The symbol in the sky had, therefore, to Satan all the significance of defeat and to the faithful guards of Paradise all the consolation of victory. To their higher intellects, able in some degree to foresee events, it was precisely the same as though the battle had taken place, and the Fiend had been defeated. The poet's audacity in putting himself upon the plane of those superior intelligences is equalled only by the grandeur with which, without the appliances of battle, the great purpose is accomplished. Satan is driven out of the Garden; and, fearful lest he should again be discovered by sharp-sighted Uriel, regent of the Sun, flies in anguish for seven continuous nights—that is, a whole week—following the darkness about Earth (ix. 62–66). Time is thus gained for Raphael to warn Adam of his grand Foe. Remembering how consistently Milton exalted the spiritual, we shall be much less puzzled to account for his preference of *Paradise Regained*, with its description of the moral triumph of Christ over the Tempter, to the triumph through mere physical strength of Messiah over his adversaries on the plains of Heaven.

Heaven, then, is distinguished chiefly by its intellectual and spiritual conditions; and it cannot be imputed as a fault to Milton that he has not given us such images as those which M. Taine eloquently prefers:—"The visions of Dante, the souls floating like stars amid the harmonies, the mingled splendors, the mystic roses radiating and vanishing in the

azure, the impalpable world in which all the laws of earthly life are dissolved, the unfathomable abyss traversed by fleeting visions like golden bees gliding in the rays of the deep central sun." Inexpressible material beauty is not wanting in Milton's Heaven, but there is with it nothing of luxuriousness or languor, nothing that charms and soothes and lulls to sleep the high faculties of the blessed, but that which invigorates, renews and satisfies them.

We are now prepared to understand what interpretation Milton put upon various Scriptural expressions. Let us notice but two or three which are closely connected with our subject. The inspired Record declares that at the Creation "God made the firmament, and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters which were above the firmament." Milton paraphrases it thus:—

"And God made  
The firmament, expanse of liquid, pure  
Transparent, elemental air, diffused  
In circuit to the uttermost convex  
Of this great round."

The waters above the firmament, Raphael tells Adam, are formed into a wide crystalline ocean, otherwise known as the Ninth or Crystalline Sphere, in order to remove the misrule of Chaos far from the outermost star of the Universe. None of the heavenly bodies are found in the Ninth and the Tenth Spheres. Not delaying with this, we may mention another point the poet's comment upon which is interesting. Some imagine that Heaven is at the centre of the Starry Universe,—"the one spot that has no motion but basks in majestic and perfect repose while beholding the whole ponderous materialism which it ballasts in course of circulation about it" (*Ecce Coelum*, p. 151). Would not such be amazed to find that for two hundred years there has existed the conception, though expressed in less turgid language, of a Heaven vastly greater than all that is included within the orbit of the very outermost body of the "universe system" of which the "central Heaven" is but an infinitesimal part? Such is Milton's comment upon the words of the Saviour promising to his followers "many



mansions" in his Father's house; so measureless is the inheritance of the sons of God. What a profound meaning, too, is given to those words addressed from Heaven to Dives in the place of torment:—"Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed!" The gulf is the vast Abyss which the poet calls Chaos; and, if the Scriptural phrase is to be taken literally, no explanation of it, either in the Ptolemaic system, which fixed the empyreal Heaven in circuit about the Primum Mobile, or in the modern system which supposes Heaven to be at the centre of the astronomical Universe, is comparable to this of what we may call the Miltonic system in either plausibility or grandeur.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING THE BIBLE TO THE CHILDREN.

By Rev. JAMES W. RICHARD, A. M., Prof. in Carthage College, Ill.

In the English Channel lies a group of gneiss rocks, daily submerged by the tide—the scene of many a shipwreck. In the year 1700 a wooden lighthouse was erected on these rocks. Three years later it was washed away, with its architect. Soon another of wood and stone took its place. This was burned. Then a third was built of Portland oolite incased in granite firmly dovetailed into the solid rock. This is the famous Eddystone Light-house, on which are inscribed the words, "To give light and to save life." For nearly one hundred and twenty years, that Light-house, constructed on the model of the forest oak, has withstood all the storms of wind and wave. In its top burns constantly a powerful fixed light, sending forth its rays far and wide over the dark waters, giving light to the mariner and helping him safe into port.

For almost six thousand years, the human family has been sailing over the dark and dangerous ship-wrecking sea of time. In this long period, not only many individuals, but even whole nations, have been dashed to pieces on its breakers, and have

gone down to perish forever. The wisest and best men of the successive ages have sought, and labored hard, to find means by which their fellows might be securely guided into some haven of peace and rest. But all their inventions have like the former light-houses of the Eddystone, either perished, or have been found utterly inadequate to the wants of man: so that nothing ever devised could give light and save life, until God spoke by the mouth of prophets and apostles, and gave his own Son as "the true Light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." The light of the Word of God came to the rescue, when all other means had failed and demonstrated their utter inadequacy. It continues un-supplanted after the test and lapse of thousands of years, the only light which man needs for directing his course in the voyage of life, and for landing him safe and happy on the eternal shores. It is a light which shows every danger to be encountered, and which it does with such proofs of heavenly wisdom and authority in its nature and appointments, as cannot be overthrown, and as can be ignored only at the imminent peril of him who dares to resist or defy the will of the great God, the Judge of all. It is a light, too, designed for all conditions of men, and for all ages, for the young as well as for the old, and in this latter particular the Bible and *its* religion differs essentially from all other sacred writings and *their* religions. The heathen mythologies did not embrace the children in their systems. The gods of Greece and Rome were not born into the world as children, and hence took no notice of the little ones. The Koran ignores them. Hindooism finds no place for them. Indeed the sacred writings of all nations, except those of the Jews and the Christians, are too shockingly immoral and disgusting to be placed in the hands of the children. But with the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments the case is altogether different. The command given to the Jews was, "These words which I command thee this day shall be in thy heart. And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, and shalt talk of them when thou sittest in thine house and when thou walkest by the way, when thou liest down and when thou

risest up;" while the great elemental fact of Christianity is a child conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary, a child who "increased in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and man." This book, the Bible, may with safety and the greatest profit, be placed in the hands of the children, for, although they may not understand its mysteries, yet they can believe them, embrace them and illustrate them in their daily walk and conversation. And as the Bible contains not only inspired religious doctrines, but also inspired and infallible social and political maxims, the wisest precepts, the purest and loftiest sentiments, its contents cannot be too diligently and faithfully taught to the children, since their characters, as men and women, will depend almost wholly upon the principles they imbibe in early education. Indeed, as the Bible contains all the necessary directions for the attainment of true and genuine happiness, all the germs and fundamental principles of right social and political development, it is of prime and essential importance to the individual, to society, and to the state, that every child born into the world should early come to a knowledge of the Truth. In this Article we propose to speak of the Importance of Teaching the Bible to the Children, under the three-fold aspect of the Religious, the Social and the Political.

#### I. THE RELIGIOUS ASPECT.

The word of God is the principal, and in connection with the Sacraments, the *only* means of grace. Through it, and through it alone, does the Holy Ghost work the conversion and salvation of the soul. Without it, so far as known to us, God will draw none unto Christ. Hence he has endowed the Word with an "active, supernatural, and truly divine power of producing supernatural effects; in other words, of converting, regenerating, and renewing the minds of men." It is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword. It is a lamp to our feet and a light to our pathway. It is divine truth, fitted and adapted to the wants of our intellectual and moral being, and as such it cannot be brought into contact with the head and the heart, attended as it al-

ways is by the presence and mighty energy of the Spirit, without producing a result. The result which its Author has designed that it shall produce, and which it will infallibly produce, where the opposition and self-assertion of the will do not prevent, is the conversion and sanctification of the soul. This is a result, too, which no other instrumentality ever offered to man can produce. Hence, God having given this Word as the full and final expression of his will in regard to our salvation, as the eternal Truth, as the sword of the Spirit, there is nothing further, nothing higher, nothing else at all adapted to the great work to be done; so that we may safely conclude, wherever this Word is used in its simplicity and in the grandeur of its power, it will become a sure savor of life unto life, or of death unto death; of life unto those who receive it, of death unto those who reject it. When it is brought into contact with the mind and the heart of the child, where the prevailing disposition is to believe every thing, and where no inclination to disbelieve and to cavil has yet been excited, then there is the fairest prospect that the Truth will accomplish that whereunto God has sent it. In the heart of the child the seed of the Word falls upon soil warm and congenial, where it will most likely spring into life and bear fruit, and will be least likely to be choked by the thorns of sin and worldliness. The precepts of the Law have in them all that majesty and authority which are calculated in their nature to fill the child-mind with reverence and awe. The simple story of Jesus folding the little ones in his arms, and dying on the Cross to save poor lost sinners, contains a tenderness and pathos which will always excite in the child the liveliest emotions of love and gratitude. The precepts of the Law and the story of the Gospel united into one grand harmonious system of heavenly doctrine, and pressed upon the mind and heart of the child, are almost certain to make it the subject of the Spirit's most gracious and salutary operations. Whereas, if the child be left to grow old, and to become hardened in the practices of sin, the circumstances are powerfully adverse to his giving his heart to Christ. Habits of unbelief have been formed;

the will has become obstinate, and the heart cold and dead. For every hour the mind is left without the knowledge of the Word of God, it receives impressions hostile to the Truth, and becomes more inaccessible by the Holy Ghost, who alone can change the heart through the Word.

"Give me the children," said St. Francis Xavier, "until they are seven years old, and any body may take them afterwards. They will be Catholics in spite of bibles." These words contain the secret of Roman Catholic power and influence during the last three or four centuries. Since the days of the Reformation they have been assiduous and untiring in their attention to the children. Neither time nor pains have been spared to bring them into hearty accord with the doctrines and practices of their Church. The crucifix, the holy water, the paraphernalia of priestly trappings, are held up before the children continually. They are taught to count their beads, to make their genuflections and say their Jesu Marias as soon as they can walk and talk. The result is a most faithful and loyal attachment to the church. But Protestants, with an open Bible in their hands, and professing the conviction that it alone is able to make wise unto salvation, do actually often suffer their children to grow up in almost utter ignorance of even the simplest and most elementary doctrines of the Word of God. The result is that many children, generically by birth, or sacramentally by Baptism, the children of the Church, are neglected by the Church and allowed to grow up in sin and folly.

Now, it is high time that the Protestant Church should learn wisdom from her adversary—should change her tactics, by doing, not less for the adult, but vastly more for the child. It is high time she should discover that preaching to the old and hardened sinners is attended by few and comparatively insignificant results, but that faithful, diligent instruction of the young promises a large and abundant harvest of good fruits. The wise tiller of the soil does not wait until the field is overgrown with thorns and thistles, and has become hard and parched by drought, before he sows the seed. He sows it when the ground is clean, mellow, and moist, in order

that the seed may germinate and spring up and pre-occupy the soil. It is bad philosophy and poor economy for the church to withhold the Truth from the tender and comparatively unoccupied mind of the child, until it is filled with secular cares and objects of worldly ambition, thinking the child is too young to understand the Truth, or to profit by it. The mistake is made in supposing that the Word of God is addressed to the head rather than to the heart, that it is an object of comprehension rather than a *ground of faith and confidence*, that it must be *understood* before it can be *believed*. There never was a greater fallacy than this. So simple and plain are the great fundamental doctrines and saving truths of the Gospel, that the way of salvation is just as easy to the child of a few years as to the adult of matured understanding; and that too in itself considered, without taking into the account the usual differences of character and habits in the subjects. When this is done the balance hangs heavily in favor of the child. "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise." Also, in this matter of conversion it is too often forgotten that the Holy Ghost, through the instrumentality of the Word, does not require a *co-operation* of the will, but an absence of *opposition*. When the opposition to the Truth is least, as in the child, the Truth will always be most effective in preparing the heart for the cleansing and purifying of the Holy Ghost. In other words, if the mind of the child be early filled with the great fundamental doctrines of the Bible, such as the being, attributes, and providence of God, the sinfulness and helplessness of man, the gift and atonement of Christ, it will have in it that divine seed, which under ordinary circumstances, the Holy Ghost will cause to germinate and grow until it yield the peaceable fruits of righteousness; for "such is the virtue and power of the Word that when it is recalled to mind, or heard and considered with serious attention and interest, it never passes away without fruit, but always engages, retains, and excites the hearer with some new intelligence, delight, and devotion, and purifies his feelings and thoughts. For the

words are not putrid or dead, destitute of sap and vigor, but truly living and efficacious." This being the nature and power of God's word, what can be more important than that it form an essential part of the knowledge and intelligence of every child?

Man is essentially a religious being; but the *form* of his religion will depend almost entirely upon the training of his childhood. He will be a Pagan, a Mohammedan, a Roman Catholic, or a Protestant, according as he has been taught in early life. Missionaries to the heathen understand this, and hence concentrate their efforts almost entirely upon the young. A grown-up idolater, however, is not much harder to convince and to convert than an old and hardened sinner at home. Each has his mind pre-occupied with thoughts that are hostile to the Truth. Each has a conscience that is perverted. Each has a will that is grown strong in the opposite direction. Neither can see and feel and act as once he could have done, and hence the possibilities of his conversion are weakened every hour, and that, mainly, because of the prejudices that have been formed *against* the Truth. But when the child has been faithfully and tenderly instructed in the Word of God, he will imbibe its principles and cherish its doctrines, and will grow, almost unconsciously, into the habit of worship. A reverence for God, a respect for his Holy Day, a regard for the services of the sanctuary, will early become fixed and definite qualities in the child's character. The Law will be so inscribed on his heart, that he will tremble to take the name of God in vain, or to use any of the divine ordinances profanely and sacrilegiously. He will grow into manhood with his predilections formed in favor of Christ and the Church. He will soon come to look upon religion as a duty and a pleasure, and to feel that its yoke is easy and its burden light. He will choose his companions from among the people of God, and will not 'walk in the counsel of the ungodly, nor stand in the way of sinners, nor sit in the seat of the scornful, but his delight will be in the Law of the Lord.' When he goes out into the world, exposed to temptations and trials, like Joseph and



Daniel he will *stand*. His answer to the solicitations of evil will be, "How can I do this great wickedness and sin against God?" At the proper time he will also take his place in the Church, as one trained for her service, and he will love and honor her, as the mother through whom he received spiritual birth and nourishment. His earliest and fondest recollections will cluster around her, and he will ever be ready to say, "If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning. If I do not remember thee let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth; if I prefer not Jerusalem above my chief joy."

In order, however, that the best results may be secured, the Bible must be taught in its *purity and simplicity*. As a perfect Word of truth the Bible needs no supplementing. All foreign admixtures reduce its efficiency as an instrument of the Holy Ghost. A vigorous and healthy Christianity can be produced only by the sincere milk and the strong meat of the Word. The Christianity of the present day is largely of the maudlin and sensational type. It was produced in the Sunday Schools and in Christian homes during the last two or three decades, merely by the memoirs of boys and girls too good to live, by Oliver Optic stories, and such like vapid and demoralizing nonsense. It is a Christianity founded in vague sentimentalism, and is guided by feeling, and not by an abiding confidence in the Word; seeking to be delighted with the beautiful and the eccentric from the pulpit, rather than to be instructed and edified by the strong and nourishing doctrines of God. Its taste, formed on the vitiating and corrupting models exhibited in the Sunday School and elsewhere during the last quarter of a century, cannot bear the simple plain truths of the Gospel; and a half temporizing pulpit, instead of rebuking and condemning it, too generally, alas! panders to it. Now, the only thing that can produce a normal taste, and form a correct judgment, and make the next generation of Christians truer, stronger, and more evangelical than their fathers are, is their thorough and faithful indoctrination in the precepts and practices of God's Word. This will give stability and character to their

profession, direction to their thoughts, and a firm foundation to their faith. They will not judge of their spiritual state by so false and uncertain a guide as feeling, but they will lay hold of the Word as substance, as something which has tangible reality, and which cannot be shaken, though the heavens fall and the earth be burned up.

But a reformation has been begun. The higher Christian intelligence of to-day has discovered the shallowness and inadequacy of former methods, and is expressing itself in favor of more Bible study and Bible instruction. A sentiment is forming against the trashy and demoralizing literature which has so long crowded the shelves of our Sunday School libraries, and is urging that they be filled with Bibles and Testaments and orthodox evangelical commentaries on the same. This advanced sentiment is taking the trifling and insipid story-book out of the hand of the child, and substituting for it the lesson-leaf. It is making the systematic study of the Bible the main feature in the Sunday School, so that, after a few years, every child that goes out from the Sunday School will have a clear outline of practical divinity in his mind. The result is inevitable. God's word will not return unto him void. It will accomplish that whereunto he has sent it. It will make the next generation of Christians more simple, more evangelical and more God-fearing than the present. It will give them less of the gaudy show and pharisaical cant of religion, but vastly more of its soul and energizing power. Under this regimen, they will grow unto the measure of the stature of fullness in Christ, "no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men and cunning craftiness," but, because they are 'grounded and settled in the faith, they will be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh a reason of the hope that is in them, with meekness and reverence.'

The question is often asked, Why are so few children in the Sunday School converted? The answer is easy: Because they are so imperfectly instructed in the elementary principles of the Gospel,—because Christ is so seldom pressed upon

them through the Word,—because when the lesson is taught, the children are not urged to meditate upon it, to pray over it, and to accept it by a living faith. When the true method of teaching the whole truth, and nothing else but the truth, is adopted, and the application is made direct and personal, then will we see our children crowding to the altar and giving their hearts to Christ, while the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh in which they shall say that they have no pleasure in the ways of religion and holiness.

Between the ages of seven and twelve, while the heart is tender and the conscience is quick, is the time during which children receive their most lasting impressions for weal or for woe. If at this time of life, the precepts and doctrines of the Bible be so wrought into their understanding and convictions, as to become an important and essential part of their knowledge and thoughts, we may reasonably hope that the balance of power will be clearly on the side of Christianity, and the Holy Spirit will find ready the appropriate instrument for his work. It is God's will that all men be saved and come to the knowledge of the Truth; nor does he confine himself to the adult. His will also extends to the children; for we hear the prophet ask, "Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breast." The Saviour in giving pastoral advice to Peter, as the representative apostle, said, *first*, "*Feed my Lambs.*" He also said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven," and actually pronounced a woe against him who should offend one of the little ones who should believe on him; thus clearly showing that even little children are capable of faith and are acceptable members of his Church. "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." God has appointed the means for their salvation. Christ has given the command, "Make disciples of all." The Church which neglects the children is false to her Lord. The Church which feeds and takes care of the lambs, is both obedient to the commands of her Lord, and wise in

the management of her own interest. Indeed it is one of the most imperative and solemn duties of the Church, to make the most liberal and extensive provision for the pious training of the children. Should she do every thing else that it required of her, yet will she be sadly delinquent until she has met this requirement; and her advancement and prosperity will always be in proportion to her fidelity in discharging her Lord's command: "*Feed my lambs.*" All the ages are full of examples showing the value of early religious training. To mention names were superfluous. Any one at all familiar with the Bible and the biography of the Church, can easily make out a long catalogue of illustrious witnesses to the value of early religious training. Indeed, the Church has seldom had a great champion, reformer, or divine, who was not the subject of religious impressions in childhood. Does not this last fact lay a tremendous weight of responsibility upon pastors and Sunday School teachers? In teaching the Scriptures to the young do they not wield an instrument which must become, not only a savor of life unto life, or of death unto death, to the individual, but which must also exert a mighty influence in the production of far-reaching and momentous consequences to the Church? Do they not have it in their power, by faithfully and affectionately applying the Truth, to train souls for the highest usefulness on earth and for glory and honor in heaven? The instrument which God has placed in the hands of pastors and teachers is his own Word. Hence to the law and to the Testimony, and if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no truth in them.

## II. THE SOCIAL ASPECT.

The world is full of social evils, and almost as full of inventions to remove them; yet passion, lust and pride are as rampant as ever they were. "When some one was enlarging to Coleridge on the tendency of some scheme which was expected to regenerate the world, the poet flung up into the air the down of a thistle which grew by the roadside, and went on to say, 'The tendency of that thistle is towards China; but I know, with assured certainty, that it will never get

there—nay, it is more than probable, "that after sundry eddyings, and gyrations up and down, and backward and forward, it will be found somewhere near the place in which it grew." Such has ever been the issue of those boasted schemes of human wisdom which have professed to change the heart of man," or have sought to remove the evils that afflict and burden society.

Intemperance is stalking over the land like a mad demon, desolating homes, creating widows and orphans, filling the nation with criminals and paupers, and dragging its tens of thousands down to hell annually. How to arrest the havoc and desolation, has long been the query of philanthropists and reformers. Many years ago the Sons of Temperance Society was organized, but soon failed. Then came the Washingtonian movement, and it failed. Afterwards rose, with great pretensions, the Good Templars. They likewise failed. They all failed, and deserved to fail, because they did not honor God, his Word, and Church. They almost entirely ignored the Bible and the Sword of the Spirit. They forsook the only weapon that can pierce the armor of so mighty a foe, and took the weapons of human device. They set up the wisdom of men in place of the wisdom of God, and God, I believe, as a lesson to his people and his Church, purposely brought all their schemes to nought.

Now, the only way that Intemperance can be successfully met, is by a faithful use of the Word of God against it, and that not so much by preaching to those, who by long familiarity with its ravages, have grown indifferent to them, nor to those who are being swept along by its strong tide, as by exposing the *sin* of Intemperance to the children, and getting them to form their characters and habits against it. Let it be shown to them that no drunkard shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, that a woe is denounced against him who looketh on the wine when it is red in the cup, and who giveth his neighbor to drink, and putteth his bottle to him and maketh him drunk. Let it be shown the children that Intemperance is not only a great social vice, in that it brings suffering and shame into the community, but that it is also a great *sin*

against God, in that it brutalizes and degrades his noblest handiwork, and damns the soul. Let the beauty and virtue of temperance and sobriety, with all their attendant blessings and honors, be held up before them continually. Let them be impressed with the fact, that intemperance is both inconsistent with virtuous principles and destructive of Christian character. Let them be taught to look upon sample-rooms and grogshops as gateways to hell.—Let all these things be done in the Sunday School, in the catechetical class, at the fireside of Christian homes, and the next generation will be a well organized army against Intemperance. The Sunday School teachers and Christian parents of the land have it quite within their power to create such a sentiment in the hearts of the young, by a faithful and diligent use of the Word of God, that in twenty-five years, Intemperance will slink away and hide itself in the caves and dens of the earth; and all this without the aid of temperance organizations, of which there is no more need than there is of anti-lying, anti-swear-ing, anti-dishonest, and the like societies. The Church of Jesus Christ, into which every effort should be made to bring the children of the Sunday School and of Christian homes, after faithful religious instruction, is the only true temperance organization, as the vows of a holy life are the only secure and valid temperance pledges. The root of the evil extends so deep that human appliances cannot reach it. When the thirst for strong drink has once been created, divine grace is needed to quench it. But precaution is always easier and safer than cure. Hence the importance, yea, the necessity of using those means which God has given for the suppression of Intemperance.

There is another great social evil which can be removed only in the same way, and by the use of the same means which must be employed against Intemperance. It is an evil which this fastidious age refuses even to call by its right name, but euphemises it as the *SOCIAL VICE par excellence*. The Bible calls it *fornication, adultery, uncleanness*, and I know I do not shock the modesty of any true Christian lady or gentleman, by using the very words which the Saviour and

his apostles used. This dreadful sin is in our midst, and we dare not shut our eyes and hold our tongues in regard to it. It is eating out the vitals of this nation and pouring poison into its blood. Its haunts are all over the land, in every city, town, village and hamlet. Its victims are multiplied legions, claimed from every rank and condition of society. It has crept into senate chamber and congressional hall, has stained the surplice and polluted the ermine; has sundered the conjugal tie and consumed the parental joy. It flaunts its gorgeous banners in our faces as we walk the streets by day, and hangs out its lurid lights as we pass by night. It builds its gilded palaces on the crowded thorough-fare, and opens wide its halls of mirth, where, with music, dancing and intoxication, it lures its victims on to hell. The all-important question is, How shall we arrest it? Shall we go out and preach continence and virtue to the libertine and the prostitute? It would be casting pearls before swine. They would trample them under their feet, and turn again and rend us. Shall we call in the arm of civil authority? This is too short, and, alas! itself too frequently subservient to the same sin. What shall we do? We must take God's Word and teach his sixth commandment, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," to the children. Laying aside all squeamishness and mock-modesty, we must teach our children, both publicly and privately, that fornication and adultery are an abomination in the sight of God and are most surely damning to the soul. We must be careful to show its relation to the divine law, and its degrading and polluting effects upon its victim. We must emphasize the deep moral turpitude of the *sin*. We must also show them how it wrought ruin and overthrow among the chosen people of God, stained the hands of David with the blood of murder, and caused Solomon to build the temple of idols along side the temple of the living God.

"A turpi meretricis amore

Cum deterreret: 'Scetani dissimilis sis.'

Ne sequeretur moechas, concessa cum venere uti

Possem: 'Deprensi non bella est fama Treboni,



Aiebat. Sapiens, vitatu quidque petitu  
 Sit melius, causas reddet tibi; mi satis est, si  
 Traditum ab antiquis morem servare tuamque,  
 Dum custodis egres, vitam famamque tueri  
 Incolumem possum; simul ac duraverit aetas  
 Membra animumque tuum, nabis sine cortice Sic me  
 Formabat puerum dictis."—*Horace, Sat. Lib. Prim. IV.*

By the faithful and diligent use of precept and example drawn from the Word of God (because these are always more authoritative), illustrated by the results of daily observation, we may so fortify the children against the dreadful sin of uncleanness, that when they have grown into manhood and womanhood, they will form a Christian society, chaste in thought and chaste in life. And, although individuals will continue to fall while the world stands, yet the religion of Jesus Christ and the Word of God have the power, when applied at the right place, at the right time, and in the right manner, so to subdue its passions, so to elevate and purify the affections, so to strengthen and fortify the conscience as in a few decades to shut up and overthrow every brothel and every assignation-house in the land.

"Is there no balm in Gilead? Is there no physician there?" The only balm is the Word of God. The physicians are the God-fearing pastor, the faithful Sunday School teacher, the devout and watchful parents. If these apply the balm properly and at the right time, soon this dreadful soul-and-body-destroying "hurt" of the American nation, (I believe its greatest, most alarming sin), with all the attendant evils of easy and frequent divorce, and the cruel murder of the unborn children, will be healed. Mere civilization and intellectual refinement cannot purify and elevate the sentiment on these great subjects—they cannot cure that which they themselves have either caused or occasioned. The more civilization, the more mere human refinement there is, the more voluptuousness, says the concurrent voice of history. Of the ancient heathen Germans, Tacitus says, "*Nemo illic vitia ridet; nec corrumpere et corrumpi sueculum vocatur.*" \* \* \* *Numerum liberorum finire, aut quemquam ex angustis necare, FLAGITIUM*

HABETUR" *plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges*;\* and gives us a deep insight into the terrible social corruptions at civilized Rome when he tells us in his Annals, among other things bearing on the same subject, "*Nec ideo conjugia et educationes liberum frequentabantur, PRAEVALIDA ORBITATE*,"† notwithstanding the *Lex Julia et Papia Poppaea* had been enacted purposely to promote marriage and the rearing of children. If a right sentiment on these vital and all-important social subjects is to prevail, God must speak. The *divine* law must be promulgated and enforced. Philosophers and social reformers can accomplish almost nothing in this line, because, in the language of Tertullian, "Their systems of virtue are but the conjectures of human wisdom, and the power which commands obedience is merely human; so that neither the rule nor the power is indisputable, and hence the one is too imperfect to instruct us fully, and the other too weak to command us effectually, but both these are abundantly provided for in a revelation from God." Out of this *revelation* must the children and youth be instructed, and according to its precepts and examples, must their characters be moulded, if we would bring society up to that high standard of virtue and charity which is essential, not only to her best interests and her highest welfare, but also to her very existence. The same thing also must be said in regard to stealing, lying, swearing, and the like. The only adequate sword we can unsheath against them is the commandment of God, "Thou shalt not lie, nor steal, nor swear." Power and authority are not wanting in the Bible to regenerate the world. We, the Christian pastors, Sunday School teachers and parents are sadly wanting in boldness to denounce these sins, and in faithfulness to use the means divinely appointed for their suppression. We rely too much on our boasted civilization and the splendid advantages of our educational systems. In our zeal to cultivate the mind we too much overlook and neglect the heart. We too frequently ignore the religious and the moral element in our children, and thus are in dan-

\* Germ. XIX.

† Ann. III. 25, 26 et XV. 19.

ger of making them only the more intelligent *criminals*. Prison statistics are beginning to make some most startling revelations on the connection between education and crime. Of the one thousand three hundred and fifty-three convicts, in the Illinois State Penitentiary, December 1st, 1874, when the last biennial report was made, one thousand and twenty-six could both read and write; one hundred and twenty-seven could read only; and two hundred were without any education. Of the entire number, eight hundred and eight professed no religious belief; two hundred and eighty-nine were Catholics; the others were divided between eighteen different denominations. Of the one thousand and eighty-four convicts in the two penitentiaries of Pennsylvania, January, 1873 (the latest report accessible to the writer), nine hundred and twenty-eight could read and write. The reports from the other States where intelligence generally prevails, show about the same percentage who can read and write. Now, whatever may be the cause of crime, it is very evident, from these statistics, that popular education does not prevent its commission; nay, it is a very serious question whether mere secular education does not become the most powerful auxiliary to crime, by inventing the means of its commission and the ways of escape from punishment. Indeed, with the memory of Credit Mobilier, Salary Grab, Pacific Mail Subsidy, Whiskey Rings, gigantic swindles, official speculation, etc., fresh in our minds, to say nothing about the spirit of general dishonesty and bad faith that pervade the country, we are compelled to say, that our present method of training the young is by no means adequate to the wants of society. The intellect is cultivated and developed well enough, but the heart and conscience are too generally neglected. Along with books of literature and science, the Bible and the catechism must be placed in the hands of the children. They must be taught authoritatively to honor God, and to respect the rights of their fellow-men, to subdue selfishness, and to act from manly principle, before they can become safe and useful members of society. A very large proportion of the children of this country are growing up wholly destitute of

all moral and religious training. In the city of St. Louis there are, it is said, a hundred and twenty thousand young persons, between the ages of five and twenty, who never enter a church or a Sunday School room from one year to another. Nor is this state of things confined to a single city. It is all over the land. Children are growing up by the tens of thousands, and are being educated by the state, to corrupt and annoy society, to fill penitentiaries, alms-houses, and dishonored graves. The only way that we can resist the flood of crime and of social corruption and degradation, which, with swelling tide, is rolling over the country, is by bringing more of the children, and if possible all, under the influence and the power of the truth as it is in Christ. When all the Christian people go to work with the young, in earnest, and do faithfully teach them God's Word, then they will assuredly organize and set in motion those forces which will ultimately cleanse this whole world of its pollution and violence, and will inaugurate the prophetic reign of peace and good-will, when they shall not hurt nor destroy in all the holy mountain of the Lord.

### III. THE POLITICAL ASPECT.

The true idea of a state is that of a body of people united under one government for mutual protection in life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Whatever state or government does not protect its citizens in these three particulars, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, has no right to *exist*. In all good government, each individual must surrender certain preferences in order to secure the highest welfare of the entire community. In this surrender of personal preferences, there is no loss or abridgment of liberty to the individual, but a guaranty is given and received that the rights of all shall be respected. Now this is the only way by which liberty can be preserved and happiness promoted,—the only way by which the true ends of government can be attained. In this particular feature of mutual concession do the best modern governments differ from the governments of antiquity. In the great monarchies of Asia, the central idea

was subserviency to the will of the sovereign; in Greece, it was the supreme exaltation of the state as an end in itself; at Rome it was the dignity and honor of the senatorial and equestrian orders, to the almost entire exclusion of the rights and privileges of the masses—ending in imperialism, whose vestiges may still be seen in nearly all the countries of Continental Europe. Now whence this difference of view between the ancients and the moderns in regard to the fundamental idea of government? Why is it that the ancients were guided almost wholly by selfishness and ambition, while the moderns recognize the rights of the individual, and estimate the character of a government by the degree of happiness it promotes among its citizens? There is somewhere an adequate cause for this difference. It cannot be found in superior wisdom and natural benevolence. It must be sought outside of human nature and of merely human endowments. It is found in the knowledge of that great fundamental fact, that of one blood God created all nations of men; which gives them certain natural and inalienable rights which are not dependent upon the accident of noble birth, or the circumstance of great wealth and high position, but which are the direct gifts of God. In other words the Bible has brought out and elevated the self-consciousness of the individual, and claimed for him equality before the law, has shown that "the powers that be are ordained of God," and that states and governments are only means to an end, which end is the promotion of good order and the advancement of the individual to higher freedom and greater happiness. While it does not interfere with existing political institutions, but enjoins obedience—"render tribute to whom tribute; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor,"—its spirit is most hostile to tyranny and oppression, and its tendency has always and everywhere been, to enlarge the mind and to create independence of thought, feeling, and action. For this reason tyrants have always hated the Truth, the knowledge of which makes man free. Rome has ever withheld it from her people, because the intelligence it brings, and the self-assertion it produces, are most

fatal to her vast assumptions over the souls and bodies of her subjects. Protestants have spread out its pages before their children and sought to make it the corner-stone of all their civil institutions. According to its principles, and guided by its spirit, have they framed the wisest and best laws and produced the noblest, truest and most unselfish patriotism. Howard, Hawkins, Drake and other illustrious patriots that adorned the court and defended the kingdom of Elizabeth, were brought up under the influence of an open Bible; and when the proud *Armada*, the offspring of ignorance and bigotry struck against the mighty bulwark of English liberty, she was dashed to pieces like a potter's vessel. From that hour to this, England has gone on with an open Bible in her hand, extending both her dominions and her influence, until to-day they reach completely round the world. When an Eastern potentate asked Queen Victoria what was the cause of England's greatness, she replied, by handing him a Bible.

From 1618 to 1648 occurred the Thirty Years' War, which cost Germany eighteen millions of population out of thirty millions. "This war," says the historian, "was inspired by the despotic determination of the Roman Church to rule the minds and consciences of all men through its pope and priesthood." "England was lost and France barely restored to the Church of Rome, the power of Spain was declining, and the Catholic priests and princes were resolved to make one more desperate struggle to regain their supremacy in Germany."

The immediate cause of this war, the most bloody and cruel in the annals of time, does not belong to the century in which the war occurred, nor was it confined to the period of thirty years between 1618 and 1648, nor were its greatest battles fought with carnal weapons at Wimpfen, Leipzig and Lutzen; its cause was the unchaining of the Bible and the delivery of its truths to the people; it was only a part of a great moral struggle, extending through an entire century, and whose tremendous conflicts had been fought with the sword of the spirit at Wittenberg, at Worms, at Spire, at Augsburg, when the principles of civil and ecclesiastical lib-

erty were wrested from the tyrant and given to the world. When the Reformers tore the Bible loose from the cloister, they gave it to the people, and especially to the children. In 1529 Luther published his *Smaller Catechism*. This was the children's *bible*. During the interval of nearly a hundred years, from the publication of the *Catechism* to the final appeal to arms, Germany had been preparing for the mighty conflict. When the war broke out, it was found that four-fifths of her population had been instructed in the *Catechism*. Their faith was fixed. Their attachments were formed. Hence when the worst came to the worst, they could see their lands desolated, their houses burned, their wives and children murdered by the tens of thousands, they could suffer the loss of all things, but, thank God, they could not renounce or surrender the simple evangelical faith of their fathers. *For this they would willingly die!* The *Catechism* saved Germany to Protestantism, and civil and religious liberty to the world. Without it the splendid victories of the Reformation would have been lost, and Protestantism, with all the civil blessings it secures, would not to-day have an existence in Continental Europe, if indeed in the world. For in that same Thirty Years' War, Austria was conquered, and, from that day to the present hour she has been groaning under the heel of an ecclesiastico-political despotism. Had Germany been conquered, the reduction of Sweden and England must have been only a question of time, and the history of the last two centuries, as well as the present political condition of the world, would be altogether different from what it now is.

From these historical examples, we may easily draw conclusions in regard to the political importance of teaching the Bible to the children; not because it is a political manual; but because it is *an inspired directory of virtue and religion*, without which it is impossible to be a good citizen; and because it lays down the conditions on which alone good governments can be formed and maintained, as proved abundantly by the history of thousands of years. And if illustrations, taken from the living present be demanded, they are at hand.



Metz and Sedan tell of the power of faith and evangelicism as over against infidelity and atheism. The orderly, prosperous, and happy condition of Protestant Germany contrasts beautifully with the turbulence, disorder and wretchedness of Catholic France. In the United States there are intelligence, refinement, energy among the people; in South America there are ignorance, social degradation, and inactivity. In the United States the prevailing religion is Protestantism; in South America it is Catholicism. In each country, the institutions and the condition of the people have been moulded and formed by the religion of each. This no intelligent, unbiassed mind would presume to deny.

M. Guizot says, "Who but will acknowledge that Christianity has been one of the greatest promoters of civilization? And wherefore? Because it has changed the interior condition of man, his opinions, his sentiments; because it has regenerated his moral, his intellectual character." But if the question be asked, What *form* of Christianity has been the greatest promoter of civilization, the only correct answer would be, That *form* which has been the most efficacious in changing the interior condition of man, his opinions, his sentiments; most active in regenerating his moral, his intellectual character, in other words, Protestantism, as the history of three hundred and fifty years abundantly proves. Protestantism means an open Bible, a free Gospel. This, more than anything else, distinguishes it from Catholicism. Hence an open Bible is the most important element in civilization. Its influence upon society and the science of government has been most powerful and most salutary. In a political point of view it has been, in the highest sense, the friend and benefactor of man. It has taught the ruler how to rule, and the subject how to obey. For this reason it should be placed first among the educational influences of every land. The statesman, or the patriot, who looks forward to the future peace, prosperity, happiness and glory of his country, dare not ignore it. And in our country, at least, the time has come when every man shows enlightened devotion to the

country and her institutions, in proportion as he allows and urges the Bible to be taught to the children, who are so soon to be clothed with the high and important functions of free-men. Lovers of their country must take a stand. Rome, Rum, and Rationalism, are combining to take the Bible from our children, and to give them a purely secular education—an education of the *head* with no regard for the *heart*. Here Despotism, Licentiousness, and Irreligion, join hands to accomplish the same infernal work—the overthrow of order, virtue and liberty. The crisis is coming, is near at hand. A prominent Catholic journal sounds the alarm as follows: "In the future, when we shall have gained the ascendancy in this country, as we surely shall, then it will be true, even as our enemies now say, that there will be no more religious liberty, as there ought not to be." This threat means more than the overthrow of "*religious liberty*." It means *Vaticanism* in America. It means the extinction of republican institutions and the establishment of the papal throne in this country. The signs of the times are ominous. Rome is marshalling her hosts, and especially is she gathering round her those who hate the Bible and its salutary restraints. The conflict will soon be upon us, a conflict which will settle the question, whether a government of the people, by the people and for the people, shall exist on the globe, or whether despotism, or anarchy, shall succeed this first American experiment at free government. Purely secular education cannot save this country in the evil hour when the mighty storm shall burst upon it. Intelligence, unsanctified and without the control of Christian principles, is only so much power placed in the hands of wicked men and of the devil, with which to subvert the government and destroy the liberties of the people. The age of Pericles at Athens, and of Augustus at Rome, was exactly the period of greatest social and political degeneracy, and marks the beginning of the decline of those illustrious states. Poets, philosophers, and artists, the greatest the world ever saw, could not save them from downfall. Education must be sanctified and directed by the law of God, before it can be either safe or useful to the state.

The doctrine of personal accountability to society and to "the powers that be," must be shown to rest upon the divine ordinance, Rom. 13 : 1—4 ; and cordial submission to lawful authority must be taught the young as a duty having its sanction from God, before they can become good citizens and true patriots. If the state, as such, blindly ignores the moral training of the children, who are to make and execute the laws in the next generation, Christian people must be only the more active in trying to secure that kind of heart-culture which is essential to the perpetuity of good government. The law and authority of God must be opposed to the law and authority of bigoted and infidel school-boards, until a sentiment is created which will demand that the Bible be restored to the Public Schools and made the prime educational factor of the land.

If ever the liberties of this country are lost, it will be when the people have forsaken the Bible. "Ephraim armed and carrying bows turned back in the day of battle," because "they kept not the covenant of God and refused to walk in his law." If they are to be preserved and enlarged, it will be in proportion as the Bible is received into the moral and intellectual life of the nation. The Waldenses and the Albigenses maintained themselves against the powerful aggressions of a dominant Church, by the radical instruction of the young. If we would give our children to the state as virtuous and honorable citizens, filled with the spirit of liberty and of obedience to the laws, we must train them to feel that their first and highest duty is to God. Then when tyrants, whether ecclesiastical or secular, demand submission, they will answer as did John Knox ; "There are two Kings and two Kingdoms in Scotland. There is King Jesus and King James. And when thou (King James) wast a babe in swaddling clothes, King Jesus reigned in this land, and his authority is supreme. Here, to King James I give my *neck*, but to King Jesus I give my *obedience*." Or, if we would qualify any of them to stand at the helm to guide the ship of state safely over the rough and angry sea of time, we

must place in their hands the Bible, as the only reliable chart and compass.

But for the fact that the Bible was assiduously taught the children in this country one to two centuries ago, we would not have a free republic to-day. The Puritans got their notions of liberty from the Bible. Their children imbibed their notions from the same fountain. Hence when the decisive hour came for them to protest against tyranny and oppression, they could appeal to those great fundamental truths, learned from the Bible, that all men are created free and equal, and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; and for the support of their Declaration of Independence they could throw themselves on the protection of Divine Providence. It is furthermore significant that almost the only men who have made any lasting and salutary impression on the policy of this country, are those who in early life were imbued with the spirit of the Bible. It is true that our great statesmen have not all been Christians in the highest and best sense of that word; far from it. Many of them have been ungodly men. But it is true, with scarcely a single exception, that our great statesmen were trained in a *Christian* and not in an *infidel* or *atheistic* philosophy. Their habits of thought were moulded and directed in childhood and early life by Christian influences; and though in after years they may have ignored the Bible, they could not help reflecting its principles, as Byron, who, though he spurned the Sacred Volume, yet reproduced much of its thought and imagery in all of his truest and best poetry. The late Thaddeus Stevens (whose principles were a thousand times better than his practices) said, almost with his dying breath, "All that I am, I owe to my old Baptist mother." Daniel Webster, whose name is written indelibly on the fairest pages of America's history, said, "If there be anything in my style or thoughts worthy of admiration, the credit is all due to my kind parents for early instilling into my mind a love for the Sacred Scriptures." John Quincy Adams was taught to read the Bible by his mother, and,

throughout life, began the labors of the day by reading four or five chapters from the word of God. No wonder they called him the "Old man eloquent." And if we look abroad for names of greatest eminence in political science, we readily find those of Grotius, Selden, Montesquien, Raleigh, Burke, Pitt. If we ask, what sovereigns are to-day ruling with greatest wisdom and moderation? we hear, Victoria of England and William of Germany. Has Infidelity or Atheism a single name that in sound views and wise measures for the welfare of men can equal any one of the above? Let answer who will.

In view of the above facts on the one hand, and of our peculiar national perils on the other, what is the duty of the Christian patriot? The worst errors and vices of Europe are pouring in upon our eastern borders, and idolatry is rearing her temples in the west, while everywhere, all over the land, are the secret emissaries of the Man of Sin who claims the dominion of the whole world by divine right; to all of which may be added a very prevalent spirit of insubordination, and a general disregard of every thing which is venerable and hallowed by the flight of years. Crime has become bold, rampant, defiant, incasing herself in gold and fortifying herself behind high position. Justice is dethroned. White-robed Innocence, incorrupt Faith and pure Truth have fled; and it now becomes a serious question whether, when the light of the twentieth century first dawns upon the United States, Liberty shall have a home here, and Protestantism a place in which to worship God without fear and molestation. In this exigency of the country the Christian patriot has a great and important work to do. The tide may yet be turned in favor of justice, order and freedom; or if the mighty conflict must be settled by dint of sword, as was the case in Germany, two centuries and a half ago, the final triumph of Liberty, religious and civil, may be secured, by instilling into the minds and hearts of the young and rising generation a knowledge and love of the Sacred Scriptures. This is a duty which the Church owes to the state. If the state, as such, ignores the moral and religious training of the

children, and fails to provide against impending dangers, which threaten the overthrow of good government and the destruction of the institutions of religion, it is the duty of the Church to exert herself to the utmost to inspire the children with a love of truth, order, virtue, loyalty, and obedience to the laws of the land, in order that thereby both the state and the Church may have peace and prosperity, and may the more certainly attain their respective ends.

Experience has taught that the Bible is the best, is the only safe text-book in morals and religion. Divine truth is essentially active; mind is essentially active. Truth acts upon the mind, and the mind uses the truth. The result must be a life so far forth in harmony with the purposes of God and the proper destiny of man. If the truth be admitted into the mind of the child, it pre-occupies and holds the ground to the exclusion of error, guides its apprehensions, modifies its conceptions, and re-appears in its productions. "Train a child in the way he should go, and when he grows old he will not depart from it," is as true politically as it is morally and religiously. Breathe into his soul the freedom-giving spirit of the Bible, and he can never be a slave. Let him understand early, that God created all men of one blood and made them equal before the law, and when he comes to legislate, the knowledge of these facts will stay the hand of oppression, and guide to the formation of good and equitable laws. Convince him that rebellion and disobedience to magistrates is a sin against God, and he will be a peaceable and quiet citizen. This will be so almost of very necessity. The principles that govern our conduct are almost invariably the result of impressions received and habits formed in the course of early education. Every thought of our minds, every feeling of our hearts, every action of our wills, is modified by the pre-existing state of our faculties, and is the result of a train of antecedent causes running back, it may be to the very dawn of existence. Hence, if in early life the mind be filled with deceit, falsehood, cruelty, these must continually re-appear in the conduct of the individual. No earthly power can prevent it. If the mind be inspired with noble senti-

ments of virtue, truth and freedom, the life of the individual will be upright and honorable. In one word, if the native tendency to moral obliquity be corrected, and the child's mind and conscience be developed according to the principles of the Bible, the result will be a symmetrical and virtuous character, a useful and beneficent career. In one thus trained, the Church will find a faithful member, society a bright ornament, the state a patriotic citizen.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE TRUTH'S TESTIMONY TO ITS SERVANTS.\*

By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.

*"Demetrius hath good report of the truth itself," 3 John 12.*

Encomium can say nothing greater than this. Of the activities of Demetrius' faithful life we have no particulars. He may not have had a high position or a broad field. But this statement forms a eulogy than which none nobler could have been written, to sound down the centuries. For when the Truth has been so loved, illustrated, defended, and served, that its testimony is approval and praise, it is the token of a man's sure coronation. He is coming to a crown of glory and honor. When disobeyed and trampled on, the Truth will rise up in judgment; if served, its testimony will be no empty word, but an effectual benediction forever. It may be that the apostle meant here to record only an instance of fidelity to the specific truths of the Gospel. But we take it in its widest sense; for all truth is God's truth, and none of it is ever to be held as lying outside of the truth as it is in Jesus. We are to be true to it all, and the servants of it all, in every relation and at every point where its divine obligations touch us.

The life of the student is, confessedly and by claim, a con-

---

\* A Baccalaureate Discourse to the Class of 1875, delivered June 21, 1875.



secration to the search after truth. His very employment expresses his attitude toward it, and his interest in it. As you go forth to do your work and achieve your destiny in the midst of the great world, you come to the practical settlement of the question, upon which everything else will depend, whether your lives shall be so consecrated to the obedience and service of the truth, that in the end it may report you as faithful and give you its diadem—whether when the record of your career is finished, it may read that this one, and that, and all of you have "*good report of the truth.*" The life that is formed about truth, and has moved in its rhythmic harmonies, must become a "thing of beauty and a joy forever."

I. The first point for our attention in this subject is, that *there is such thing as truth*, real and permanent, and open to our knowledge. Scarcely any age has heard, more frequently than ours, the question of flippant skepticism, once put in impatient unbelief by Pilate: "*What is truth?*" From the bewildering conflict of opinions which attends the progress of human thought, many have been ready to doubt whether there is such a thing as truth, cognizable by us. They are inclined to look on all things as unsubstantial and illusory appearances, the movement and drifting of misguiding phantasmagoria, forming a world in the midst of which we live as in the midst of an entertaining, but perhaps spurious show. But despite the doubts of self-confused speculation, and the bewildering perplexities in which men lose confidence in all foundations of life and duty, we *are* placed in the midst of a universe of real, and mostly abiding, truth touching us in vital relations and forces at every point and every moment.

1. In the broadest and most comprehensive sense, the truth may be defined to be *all that has been, that is, and that shall be*—the sum of all realities, whether in the domain of physical, mental, or spiritual being. There are realities within us, around us, above us, binding us up in the midst of a definite constitution of things, stretching up to us out of the past, and moving on with us into the future toward the goal

which God has set for it. There is a real physical world, a grand universe of material being, with its forces, laws, and ends, in which the myriad myriad things of nature, though changeeful as the figures of kaleidoscopic diversity, arise from orderly processes. There is a higher realm of intellect, in which mind exists and fulfills its designs, under laws peculiar to itself. There is a sublime sphere of moral reality, in which laws of obligation and duty bind up every human being—the sphere in which character is formed, and its fruits ripen in consequences of blessedness or woe forever. Above all these realms of reality, is God, the Reality of all realities, whose power has made all, and whose care, in accordance with the counsels of His love, is moving everything onward toward its consummation. All this universe of being, with its material, its forces, its laws, its ends and adaptations, its relations and meaning, its origin and destiny, in the midst of which we have our place and work—all this is “the truth,” in the most comprehensive sense.

2. Truth, in a narrower sense, is *all that is known* of reality, whether discovered by reason from nature, or revealed in the word of God. This is truth according to the etymology of the Greek term, *ἀληθεία*—that which is “not hidden,” “not concealed,” known. It is the sum of apprehended reality in nature and thought. The realm of truth, in this sense, is forever enlarging, as revealed facts and doctrines are more fully grasped, as science is extending its boundaries and imagination and thought come more fully into the right ideals of moral virtue and spiritual life. Truth, in the absolute sense, goes far beyond our present knowledge—transcends all finite knowledge. We can never know all of reality in the universe, in its realms of matter, spirit, force, laws, relations, origins, ends, adaptations, influences, means, modes, and destinies, and God over all. It is an infinite quantity. There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamed of in our philosophy. We could not bear a disclosure of all. It would crush our feeble powers. Especially in the sphere of duty, of spiritual realities and relations, a full revelation

to us of all its facts, laws, responsibilities, perils, and the bearing and consequences of actions, sweeping through eternity, would be more than we could endure. Something like this would seem to be involved in the symbol of the veiled image of Isis, with the tradition that any one who should lift the veil should die. To the sinful and guilty, the full vision from the lifting of the veil from all moral truth, would be a destroying condemnation. A measure of this is expressed in St. Paul's statement of his own experience, when he described the opening of his eyes to his sinfulness: "The law came, and I died." The life he was leading, and the hopes he was cherishing could not bear the condemning revelation. And yet the truth is life to men. They must die to live. The truth kills to make alive. This work it accomplishes in passing from unknown into known truth. The great realities of being—facts, relations and duties—come to be understood, and this correct knowledge is "the truth." This enlargement of its amount is going on continually. Every age increases it, and its treasures are grand. As the stars come trooping into view, thousands on thousand more, as stronger telescopic power is brought to bear on the sky and sweep its wondrous fields, so truths are coming out, in grander fullness, upon human vision, as study and investigation go on.

It is thus apparent that the truth may be scientific, philosophic, theological, historical, or literary. It covers all departments of knowledge. Its apprehension belongs to all the faculties of the mind—of consciousness, perception, memory and the imagination, the logical understanding, and intuition. It is not to be overlooked, that the imagination, though sometimes charged with the injury of taking men only into realms of unreality and beautiful illusion, is a faculty for the apprehension of real truth, and giving us truth in its highest and most serviceable forms. In the departments of morals and religion, it furnishes the loftiest ideals of true virtue, excellence, goodness, love and duty—the grand conceptions that come nearer to the glorious realities than anything in the lower plane of actual life. The poet, of near

kin to the prophet, often becomes a revealer to common men, of the highest realities of beauty, grace and goodness. So full of truth, great, rich, and enduring truth, does the imagination show itself to be, so strangely superior in picturing the beautiful, the true, and the good, that it has been well maintained, that the man does not make poetry, but poetry makes the man; that the glorious truths of things, filling the universe, so enter into, take possession of, and form the poet's mind, that, like a reed for the breath of air, it becomes a fit instrument for the utterance of truth. The poet does not fabricate for himself the beautiful, the sublime, the right, and the good. These realities flow, in formative power, into his thought. So he does not draw a false inspiration from himself, but he becomes a poet from "the everlasting poetry of Him who has sown the sky with stars, and the earth with flowers, and who is Himself the substance of the true, the beautiful, and the good."

3. It is to be particularly observed that this whole world of truth finds its *right adjustment and unity in Christianity*. As to simple *amount*, Christianity has added immeasurably to the sum of the world's truth—opening new fields to view, clearing away the mists and darkness, and furnishing the richest treasures, without which we would be poor indeed. God is Himself the infinite personal Truth, whose thought is the prototype, and whose will is the cause of all things. So all nature, in every form, and structure and movement, reveals a thought of God, something of that infinite Truth. But in His word we have a disclosure of truth belonging to the highest, mightiest realm of reality, under which all the truths of nature are subordinated and fall into harmony. The truths of Christianity, centering in Christ as light in the sun, not only add a grand amount to our truth, but shed the true light on all other reality, adjust and unify all truth. It is admitted, in all sound philosophy, that mind is higher than matter, that the material exists for the mental and moral. Inorganic and lower nature forms the footstool for intelligent and moral beings, for whose character and welfare, glory and blessedness, dull material things are tributary and

subservient. Positivism may fling its taunts at this as much as it pleases, it cannot destroy the great fact, or dislodge it from the reason of the race. The end is greater than the means, and determines the reality, character, and movement of the means. The meaning and explanation of this world's history, are found only in the designs of God for man's character and happiness. And redemption is the explanation of these designs. So, the cross of Christ is the centre of this world's history. All things before it looked toward it—all things since have moved from it, drawing their powers from it, and going on to the goal or consummated design of which that cross was the revelation. The government of the earth, from the throne above, is in the interest of Christianity. Redemption, therefore, is the central thing that determines all; and the myriad things of material existence and of history are keeping step in the march of God's grand redeeming purposes. God's purposes are eternal. They have come out of a past eternity, and have thrown their lines of impress into the physical as well as moral structure of the world, forming it for man, with adaptations to his use while accomplishing his mission, and to come with him, at last, into complete redemption, as a new heavens and new earth. The coal and lime formations, for instance, laid up deep beneath the rocks, show how remote geologic ages and processes were looking to the coming of man, and the mission assigned him on earth, which mission is shaped by the cross of Christ. All truths have their point of agreement in this grand design of God for our world. To be fully understood all truths must be seen in their relation to Christ. All the sciences are to be held as moving in the train which He is leading, and in the midst of which He is saying: "Behold, I make all things new." This physical earth is to be held as plastic to the course of redemption, till it shall stream again through the fires.

Christian theology may be regarded as the all-inclusive term for all truth in all departments, holding within is meaning all the highest aspects of both speculative and practical science. Astronomy, geology, botany, physiology, agricul-

ture, and chemistry, may be rightly viewed as sections of theology. The end or design of the world is theological truth—its beginning or authorship is theological truth. And though there are intermediate points of structure, relation, process and movement, they are sections of the one great whole, occupying a subordinate and provisional position. A recognition of this inclusiveness and unity will put an end to the needless hostility between what is technically called science on the one hand and theology on the other. No reality will be seen in its right or full face, twisted or looked at out of its actual relation to Christ, in whom the meaning of this world centres and to which meaning it corresponds. No truth stands in right illumination unless seen in the light that falls from the cross. All things stand together in Jesus, by whom they “consist.” “As the truth is in Jesus” is a word of sublime comprehensiveness. Unless the truth “as it is in Jesus,” can report well of a man, no truth can. He has done all other a wrong, dragged it out of place, disallowed its right light to fall on it.

II. Here we come to a second point of the subject:—*what conditions a commendatory report of the truth, or how duty to it is met.*

Unquestionably, in general, this requires of you and me, and all, that we put ourselves in right relation to it; that is, to all the realities of our being, natural, moral, and spiritual, of which we are made acquainted or can learn. The general duty includes a number of particular things:—

1. *To love and seek the truth.* It is a point of unspeakable import, whether or not we love the truth and strive after it. Our attitude toward it expresses much of the character of our very souls. Archbishop Whately says, with great force: “It makes all the difference in the world, whether we put truth in the first place or in the second.” There are many who subordinate it to other things, hardly allowing it even a secondary rank in their aims. Some persons are of too apathetic nature to be stirred by any strong affection. Others are too sordid for any love so pure and noble. They are content to know but little, and become nothing. In every

age seekers after the truth, filled with burning love for it, have stood out from the stolid and sordid masses, as of nobler nature and diviner affinities. The progress of the race has been due to them. These are days when young men, especially educated young men, cannot, without treachery to duty, lose aspiration after the truth of things, or sink down into indifference as to progress in knowledge. The world is all astir with the search after truth; and the torches of the seekers are flashing in flame and smoke through every obscure angle, cave, and corner of nature. Science is leading earnest hosts, uncovering the realities of matter and mind, and calling men on to more thorough, and up to higher, acquaintance with the works and ways of God. All accessible realms are entered; and from burning suns and radiant constellations down to geologic granites, water-dripping caves and ocean bottoms, each nook and crevice, sunbeam and crystal, each fruit and flower and leaf and bud and cell and atom, is questioned and cross-questioned for its truth, for its revelation of the realities of being and life, its disclosure of the thought and working of the Creator. This search is something grand, wherever led by a love of truth. Every intelligent Christian rejoices to behold it, and if possible, to share in it. There should be no jealousy or fear of true science. Though some few scientists may stand so far away from God and His Christ, perhaps so averse to the central spiritual truth of the world, as to see and put every thing they explain in false light and bearing, yet real science can never prove injurious to spiritual truth. It will go on, as it has done, to interpret the divine thought and plan, so that both nature and revelation will be open in clearer light and be read in sublimer meaning. Devotion to science may blend with the intensest devotion to the Saviour; for all truth is His, and the point of union is too profound ever to be disturbed. This point of union is this, that those works with which science deals, and into which she bends her steady gaze, were all made by Him who laid down His life for us on Calvary. Creator and Saviour are one; nature and the Bible are two revelations of Him; and so He is King not



only over spiritual truth and redeemed souls, but over all the subordinate realms of this world of physical structure, life, brightness and beauty. "All things were made by Him, and for Him"—for His use in the saving work of His kingdom; and we should love to study the truth of his works in the interest and service of that same kingdom. The time has gone by when contempt or neglect of nature could be thought a duty or a mark of piety.

A loving and ceaseless study of the teachings of *Revelation* must, therefore, go along with the search after the truths of nature. Here your love of truth will be tested; for to much of this divine doctrine the human heart is averse. Men are disinclined to this light, because it reproves the evil to which they cling, and brings them face to face with realities, responsibilities and duties which they do not care to meet. Yet as these truths are so central and comprehensive—belonging to the highest realm of reality, sweeping eternal cycles, and at the same time lying closest of all about personal character and welfare—they are those that need to be sought with most eager interest. The word of God has been given to supply a knowledge of realities, relations, duties and consequences, far beyond the possibility of human discovery. Science has no lines to reach them—no organs to apprehend them. They are set forth to our faith. They are real, and bind the moral universe together, clasping all its movements, as gravitation does solar systems and grains of sand, in mighty embrace. There can be no excuse, now, for ignorance of them. Some of them, it is true, may not lie on the surface. They may, like some geological truths, come into view only by deep digging and intensest gaze; or, like some astronomical truth, only when the natural vision is aided by a clearing and near-bringing help. The filling of the soul with the vision of these great spiritual realities, can occur only under the impulsion of *love* for the truth, even as the learning of scientific truth demands an enthusiastic interest. If you remain ignorant of these things through indifference, surely the truth must witness against you. Its report can not be to your praise. And the report will not

sound out through air or sky, but will write itself on your very character, be made legible in your very being, left poor, and dark, and feeble by lack of the light and power of fellowship with spiritual verities. You must be faithful students of the Bible.

Love for the truth must therefore be *comprehensive*, in order to be true or successful. It is not enough, to love moral truth, and be averse to the truths of conscience—not enough to love scientific truth and dislike the truths of Christianity. Here is the test at which many fail; and their asserted love of truth is shown to be such an antipathy to it that only a small section of it is endured. They do not, indeed, resist the whole circle of knowledge, but limit their interest and fellowship to only a little part which does not cross their devotion to self. No man can be successful in seeking truth who is indisposed to see it in its harmonies and wholeness, or who shuts off from the segment at which he looks the explaining light that comes from other quarters. No man can see natural, physical truth aright, who refuses to view it in the light of moral and spiritual adaptations and bearings. No one can see scientific truth, except in distortions or half-phases, who wrenches it from the system of Christianity as the all-shaping system of the earth's existence and structure. No man can be the true scientist, except the true Christian. All others see the frame of nature apart from its spirit, the skeleton without the soul—machinery without its end. They look at nature, only as when its true sun is withdrawn. A man like J. S. Mill, taught to hate Christianity from his childhood, is in no condition to be looked on a lover of the truth, or to become either a true scientist, or philosopher. A Tyndall or a Huxley, who has no sympathy with the grand realities of being outside of the range of material structure, must look on structures without seeing their deepest meanings. Though a worker yourself in a limited department, a narrow specialty, you must be open to all truth and a lover of it, and hold your own specialty, whether of science or religion, in harmony with the unity of the whole.

2. *Obedience* to the truth is required. It will witness against

him who refuses to *conform* to it. Your right attitude toward the realities that surround and touch your being, is not attained in simply knowing them. The laws of your physical, mental and moral being must be obeyed. If you trample on them, after knowing them, they will cry out a condemnation more burning than if the truth had never dawned on your vision. How many keep their conformity to truth, in every department of reality and thought, far below their knowledge of it. How few persons there are who do not know better than they act. There are many examples of brilliant knowing, along with wretched living. The demand of the truth is often resisted, set at nought, and sometimes, as in the person of Him who was Truth's own self, spit upon. You will get no good testimony from it, if disobedient to it.

3. Further—life must be devoted to the *service* of truth. No man can be true to it, who does not give his *efforts* and *work* for its success and victory. It is not enough to obey it for one's self,—to appropriate it selfishly to one's own life. Truth is a treasure that is to be enlarged by the contributions of its millions of seekers, and made efficient and regulative throughout the earth for the welfare and blessing of all. Every man who brings unknown reality into the realm of known truth, or puts truth into living relation with even a single human soul, is a benefactor. He is serving the ends of truth—and the God of truth. He is a helper in its great mission. It writes a letter of commendation for him, and God puts His signature to it.

4. Still further, it demands that you *defend the truth*. Love for it, obedience to it, and the service of it, must make defenders of it. Truth is forever, through this world's ages, assailed by error and resisted by unrighteousness. It must make its progress and gain its victories, in constant battle with opposing powers. The warfare upon it knows no truces; the fight against it knows no stopping, at nightfall, to wait for morning. If its triumphs demand the service of its friends, it must have also their defence in the strife. The

defence is *part* of the service. There is often an outcry against the work of polemics—often a very senseless outcry, and one whose meaning is simply a plea for treachery to the truth. Its positions have often to be defended, and many of the truths of both science and religion are, at this very time, like assailed forts on which a hundred guns are opened, or around which the siege is pressed, and sappers and miners covertly work. You must neither forsake your place, nor surrender the truth on plea of peace. Truth is the instrument of righteousness, and works toward peace only by the overthrow of error and sin. This is what Jesus refers to, when He declares, "I came not to send peace, but a *sword*." And I know of nothing more holy than is the duty sometimes to smite crushing blows on the falsehoods, error, and disorder that oppose the claims of truth. The swords that have to cleave the way to the establishment of some new truth in science, the polemics that have to maintain some old truths in place, against some new pretence of enemies, the strife that vindicates moral and spiritual realities, against the materialism and unbelief that obscure or deny them—these are some of the grandest things in human life. We are not, indeed, to lose sight of love and charity in our zeal for the truth, but to vindicate the truth in the temper of kindness. We are not to fail in fidelity, even though peril, suffering, or death threaten. We are not to compromise even as did Galileo, who is often strangely referred to as presenting an instance of moral grandeur on the occasion of his trial before the inquisition for asserting the motion of the earth—consenting to recant the truth of its motion, while his soul protested in the deep undertone: "It does move." He bent to the storm, and yet as he was bending, he confessed that he was recanting against the truth. Such compromise, even for the sake of life, is far below the Christian standard of fidelity to truth. It is not the fidelity of apostles, and confessors and martyrs. You could not imagine St. Paul doing that. The Pope and Empire could force no such word of retraction from Luther. However much you may love the truth, or obey and serve it, it must qualify its report

of you, if, from love of ease, or cowardice, you fail to defend it, in your place and measure, when it is pressed by foes.

III. This fidelity to it, by which, in the end, it will report well of you, is *rich in blessings*. It is needful to make you what you should be, and bring you to the lofty benedictions to which you are called. This appears in a number of particulars:

1. It is the only way of *right formation of character*. Right character can be moulded only in and by the truth. The mind was made for it, and it for the mind; and no soul can grow healthy, strong, and good without it. Moral and spiritual truths are simply the realities of moral life; and to be out of harmony with them must mis-shape character in wrong and sin. Truth reduced to practice and turned into life, becomes righteousness. Loved, obeyed, and served, it must adjust your life in unity with itself and in harmony with the whole constitution of God's universe. It will build your character on eternal rock, with all the elements of its constitution as sound and firm as are the unchangeable moral laws of the divine government. Error reduced to practice throws the life out of agreement with the realities of being, and shapes the character in transgression and sin. Disregarding the realities and laws of the material world, or of your bodily organism, the disharmony smites you with penalty and punishes you with injury. Disregard of the truth of things in the spiritual or moral world, works its injury with equally sharp and incisive penalties. The penalties record themselves in the character, thus moulded in conflict with righteousness. It is when your life stands in Christ, the personal truth, and its mental and moral activities are directed by love and obedience to all truth as it centres and is vivified in Him, that your character is formed into the rhythm and beauty of your true being. There is blessed power in communion with the divine designs and ways. In lovingly 'thinking God's thoughts after Him,' as these thoughts are read on the pages of both nature and revelation, you will take into your life some of the order, purity and elevation of His mind and will.

Sincerity in untruth, in false relation to the realities about

you, is not enough. Sincerity or ignorance will not save from death the man who drinks poison, or the mariner from wreck who runs his vessel against the rock. Few things are more senseless than the depreciation, in these days often heard, of doctrine, of dogmas, of truth, accurate views of moral and spiritual realities. The cry of errorists, and superficial thinkers, is, 'Give us life—we do not want the dead dogmas.' But so far as doctrines are truth correctly apprehended, they are the essential necessities of right living and character. They are the realities and laws to and by which character must be adjusted. And more—as doctrine is all summed up in Christ who is at once the Truth and the Life, there is no force for right character apart from it, and to expect it, is as if we were to look for fruit without the tree, or green fields and glowing flowers without the light and heat of the sun, or bodily health and beauty, not from food, but poison. It has always been those who have loved and served the truth, those whose lives have been truly adjusted to all the great realities to which they are related in their moral being, that have exhibited the purest, loftiest and best character that has shone among men and been marked as the real handiwork of God. Never be indifferent whether you have gotten the truth, and *it*, or its opposite, is shaping your life and putting in its coloring.

2. Further—to make your life a consecration to the service of truth, so thoroughly that in the end it may report well of you, *is the way of certain and greatest usefulness*. There is high glory in living a useful life. Every young man, of proper aspiration, feels the throbbings of a desire to do good and prove a blessing in the earth. To live on the low plane of sordid aims, for money, pleasure, or honor, cannot fill out any worthy ideal of life. But truth is the instrument of blessing for the earth. To bring more truth into revelation and into victory among men, truth of any and every sort, is the thing the world needs for its regeneration and blessedness. Men are to know the truth, and the truth is to make them free, and save them. The kingdom of heaven is established in the establishment of the reign of truth. In this

way you are to come into worthy usefulness. No life lived in the love and service of truth can be fruitless. But by failure here, many a life has proved a fountain of evil rather than of good. The brilliant genius of Byron, unvitalized by love of the truth, and unregenerated by it, proved a power of blight, not of blessing. The talents of a truth-hating Shelley, had no power to do men good. Voltaire had princely intellect and learning, but he opened few streams of influence along which virtue was not withered and sin did not grow ranker. The men who have consecrated their lives, not to plans of ambition, or amassing wealth, or carnal pleasures, or simply intellectual enjoyments, but to the progress and defence of truth, have been the men who have opened or strengthened the fountains of good for the quickening, elevation, and beautifying of human life. Humble workers in this direction are above princes and all the mighty in any other. The man who clears the darkness from a single new life-truth, and gains for any great moral truth an ascendancy in a single human soul, has achieved a usefulness which places him above the Alexanders and the Napoleons of the race. The wreath of the humblest martyr in the cause of truth, is far more than that of the proudest conqueror in this world's ambitions.

There is no way to command genuine *power* among men, but this. Many a young man in picturing to himself the good he is going to do, is relying on other things—perhaps on his logic, or persuasive eloquence, or his prudent expedients and wise plans. This age is peculiarly given to machinery, adroit measures, and sensational devices; and the young are apt to fall into the idea that they will have great success by these means. But you will find cunning logic and mellifluous eloquence impotent to reform and rule men; and sin and sinners will laugh to scorn your rattling machinery constructed to carry moral power. You have seen the most brilliant talents made useless, by resting itself on, or resorting to tricks of intellectual craft. Nothing but the truth will answer. It is chosen by the Holy Ghost, as the means to reform, renew, and save men, and bless the earth. It is only



when men give up self-power and self-devised expedients, and depend upon the truth, as vitalized by the Spirit of God, that virtue goes forth from them for good. What was the secret of Luther's power, when, with a soul too earnest to think of adjusting his efforts

"to the Dorian mood  
Of flutes and soft recorders,"

he uttered the words which "shook the nations from Rome to the Orkneys," and accomplished a work which has given his life a usefulness more honorable than the brightest crown of Europe? It was that he relied upon the truth and left his work to the God of truth. In *your* sphere and measure, this is to be the way of your power to do good; and you may be assured that there will be no report of a useful life by you, unless the *truth* can report well of you.

3. One thing more. Only by such love and work for the truth will you come into the true happiness of life, and its right destiny. In the holy character so formed within you, or rather, which the grace of God will thus form, you attain, not a mere adjunct of your nature, but what will constitute your highest, enduring self. With its life in Christ the eternal truth, and shaped in love and obedience to the great laws of spiritual being, its harmonies within, and harmonies with the divine constitution of things without, will be the music of the soul's own joy and peace. There is an open fellowship between the holy soul and God; and the light of approval that comes down by way of the stars, is an overpayment for the work done and the service rendered. The character thus moulded in the symmetries of truth, while blessed here, is prepared for the joys of the future. The possibilities of high destiny are made sure. Look at it. No matter what station of duty in *this life* is before the young man in college-training, he becomes fittest for it by most completely and symmetrically unfolding all his faculties and powers, making the most of himself on every side of his nature, in his powers of thought, memory, imagination, and heart, all in the unity of his true nature. He becomes a rightly developed man, with

his capacities all brought out into facile power; and in whatever direction he is called to act, he is prepared for it. So, in the preparation which love and service to the truth gives in this life for the next. If the soul here is formed by the moulding of carnal pleasures, of earthly ambitions, or any false aims, not sustained by the realities of its true being, when the veil drops at the close of this life, it is unprepared for its destiny. It was not shaped to the realities of the new condition. But the life that is formed and moulded by eternal truth will, when the veil is lifted, be ready for the new conditions of spiritual being, whatever they may be. This will prepare a person for all possible changes. The harmonies of his being are already with God and with the everlasting laws of the moral universe; and he is at home everywhere. When at death, he catches the sound that invites him higher, he will be ready to grasp and enjoy the grander good before him; and as the ultimate fruition of this service of the truth, he will ascend to gather the harvests of heaven and pluck the rich clusters of the vine of God.

And now, young gentlemen, as you pass out from the institution into the world where your work is to be done and proved, we wish to give you this final counsel—whatever you do, consecrate yourselves to the love and service of the truth; first of all to Christ the heart of all truth, and then to all that stands together in Him, whether of nature or of grace. We feel—and speak it in the name of all your teachers—a deep and abiding interest in your welfare and success. We wish for you the *character* moulded, purified and made strong by the truth and a life in its service. We wish for you the usefulness, the happiness and glorious destiny thus attainable. And we would regret, more than our poor speech can express, if as to the disposition and life of any of you, the truth could not in the end declare a good report.

This call to fidelity applies to you all, no matter what profession or business you enter. It does not determine your profession, but your work in it. The cause of righteousness, the welfare of society, and the prosperity of the Church, are calling for men of intense consecration to the truth, in

every department of human activity—men who will put it in no second place, but the first. We want men in every department of non-professional life, in trade, mechanic art, in agriculture, whose souls are so devoted to it, that they will speak and work for it and give their treasures of influence and money to the promotion of its victories. We want teachers, who will not sacrifice it to every passing tendency of unsettled thought, and to the vanity that craves the distinction of running something new. We want physicians whose affection for the truth is so wide, that they will have active hands for its service outside of the narrow range of professional restrictions. We want lawyers whose love of truth overleaps the technic walls of statute enactments. We want scientists, ardent and devoted to the truths of material nature, but broad enough to recognize the truths of mighty import that rule the world of mind and morals, and who will not refuse to believe in God, in spirit, and moral laws, because they cannot find them in the retort or crucible. We want ministers broad enough to love and rejoice in the truths of science, and combine them all in the unity of the truth as it is in Jesus. You must indeed each have your specialty. You cannot be universal scholars, or cultivate the whole field, but you must not form your soul's life only in the truths of your little section, or wrong the integrity of truth by denying there is any thing outside of the small patch on which you are laboring.

Your recompense will be sure. You will be gathering it all the time, as it flows into your very life, in happiness and spiritual excellence, making the soul

"Like some fair spirit from the realms of rest  
With all her native heaven within her breast."

Your life will be on the strong and winning side. Out of all the struggles which agitate the world, the truth will come triumphant. "The eternal years of God are hers." And when the final victory comes, the crown will be on your brows.

## ARTICLE V.

## THE MINISTERIUM.

By Rev. Prof. S. A. ORT, Louisville, Ky.

On the question of what is called the Ministerium, opposite views have been maintained by some parties in the General Synod for a considerable time. At the convention last May, the subject was discussed in an interesting and lively manner. A vote was taken which indicated the judgment of the members then present. The matter, however, appears to be not fully and finally settled. From present indications it seems likely that the debate will continue quite a while. To this prospect there certainly can be no objection. Discussion, when conducted in a Christian spirit, is profitable. It does not necessarily belong to the statement of adverse views, that there should be the use of harsh words and the manifestation of bitter feeling. Unaccountably the impression finds a home in the minds of some, that a controversy concerning scripture doctrine or church polity, essentially involves abuse, harshness, and passion. But this is certainly a mistaken notion. If the recollection is constantly kept clear in the thoughts of disputers, that heaven and earth do not hang on the issue of debate about non-essentials, but that the practical work of building up the Church is what involves the glory of God, then no harm can result from discussing questions of minor import. Under the influence of such conviction, it is the purpose of the writer to offer a few thoughts on the subject of the Ministerium. In the discussion of any question it is of first importance to distinctly know the disputed point. Where a lack of such definite knowledge prevails, the progress of debate quite frequently reveals the fact that there is no contradiction of judgment on the part of the disputants.

According to the statement of an article, in the January REVIEW, on "A question of Church Polity," the question at issue is, "Upon whom properly devolves the duty of examining candidates for the ministry, deciding upon their qualifications, and inducting them into the sacred office?" With respect to the first and last clauses of this statement, namely, "upon whom properly devolves the duty of examining candidates for the ministry, and inducting them into the sacred office," there is really no issue taken.

The actual point of difference is neither who shall examine candidates for licensure, nor who shall ordain, that is perform the ceremony of induction into the sacred office. About the superior competency and the propriety of the ministry to conduct the examination of candidates, or about the special fitness and more orderly mode of the ministry performing the act of ordination, there is no variance of opinion. It must be borne distinctly in mind that the present is not a case of either competency, fitness, or order, but a case of inherent authority or power. The real question then about which there can be any dispute among those who adhere to the Lutheran view of Church polity is, to whom has been delegated primarily the authority to license and ordain.

That this must be the real point of debate will be shown in the progress of this article. But before so doing it may be well to bear in mind the following facts: 1st, That the setting aside of what is called the Ministerium leaves the whole business of examination of candidates for licensure just as it was before, with one exception, which involves the authority to vote: 2nd, That the setting aside of the Ministerium leaves the whole matter of ordination precisely as it was before with the same exception, because no one on the non-Ministerium side holds that the act of ordination should not be performed according to what is called the Apostolic mode; namely, the laying on of the hands of the ministry. If therefore in chaps. xviii. and xix. of the "Formula of Government," the word Synod be substituted for Ministerium, no change involving power will occur, except in the case of voting. And this unquestionably is the only amendment to

those two articles that the non-Ministerium side of the house would desire, in any case, to have recognized. The principle involved in this question, and which is claimed to be Lutheran, is not who shall examine and perform the ceremony of ordination, but who has the authority and right to say what persons shall be inducted into the ministerial office.

In regard to the question of authority and right in the making of ministers, the Lutheran view will appear sufficiently clear in the sayings of the old authorities on this subject. In making mention of these, it will only be necessary to cite the remarks of those who have been called up as witnesses for the other side of the case.

These remarks are most readily found in the article on "A Question of Church Polity," as lately published in the REVIEW. In the Smalcald Articles it is stated we read :

"For where the Church is, there indeed is the command to preach the Gospel. Therefore, the Churches undoubtedly retain the authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers. And this authority is a privilege which God has given especially to the Church, and it cannot be taken away from the Church, by any human power. \* \* \* 'Ye are a royal priesthood.' These words relate specifically to the true Church, which, because it alone possesses a priesthood, must also have power to choose and ordain ministers."

The principle most distinctly set forth in the above quotation, is the God-given authority and right of the whole Church to elect and ordain ministers. This principle was maintained by the Reformers against "the Romish doctrine of the exclusive power of the Bishops to make ministers and send them where they please, without the consent and voice of the Church;" and this principle has been maintained always by the Lutheran Church, against both the Reformed and Episcopal doctrines on this matter. This principle is not an immaterial thing in this discussion, but the vital point, the doctrine in short which settles the question. If the question is who has the authority and right to elect and ordain to the ministry, every Lutheran must say, the whole Church. But if the whole Church has the authority and right to do this work, it cannot, from the very nature of the

case, belong exclusively to a part of the Church. In this discussion, let it then never for a moment be forgotten, that the God-given authority and right to elect and ordain ministers, is vested in the whole Church—ministry and laity. The advocates of a Ministerium admit the truth of the principle just stated, but contend at the same time that the ministry alone should exercise the right. It is certainly proper to make a distinction between the right and the exercise of the right. But care must be taken how this distinction is made. If the exercise of the right on the part of the ministry be based on exclusive authority given them directly of God, then there is a contradiction of the principle which all Lutherans hold. On the other hand, if the exercise of the right on the part of the ministry alone be founded "on the common consent of all," that is the whole Church, then will the principle which all Lutherans hold be fully recognized. If, therefore, the advocates of a Ministerium are maintaining the exercise of the right on the ground that this exercise is based on the common consent of the whole Church, then most assuredly there is no difference of opinion between them and those styled opponents of a Ministerium. But if this be not so, then their views on the right and the exercise of the right are contradictory.

The distinction between the right and the exercise of the right, was strictly observed by the old Theologians and stoutly maintained under the light of the principle held by all Lutherans. In proof let the following authorities suffice:

HOLLAZ. (*Review.*)

This Theologian says: "The right of calling ministers is in the power of the whole Church, and all its parts and members. \* \* \* The calling of ministers, taken in a general and comprehensive sense, (as embracing election, ordination and calling strictly speaking,) should be so conducted by the whole Church and all three estates, that due order may be preserved and confusion avoided. And so to the Presbytery belong examination, ordination and inauguration: \* \* to the people their consent, vote and approval."

This Lutheran divine, plainly says that the right of calling



ministers is in the power of the whole Church; and that the exercise of this right for the *sake of order* belongs in part to the ministry and in part to the laity.

BAIER. (*Schmid's Dog.*)

This divine says: "After it has been planted the right and power to appoint ministers belong to the Church. For she has the keys of the kingdom of heaven given her as a Bride by Christ her husband; and therefore as it is her prerogative to open and close the kingdom of heaven, so also is it her prerogative to appoint ministers through whom she may open and close the [same.] And if we consider that the Church is a Republic, and that the ministers of the Word are, so to speak, the magistrate or conductors of public affairs, upon whom the care of the whole republic rests, it is easily understood that the power to appoint them is vested, *per se* and in the very nature of the case, in the whole Church; nor does it belong to any one part, *unless by the common consent of all it be transferred to some one part.*"

Let it be borne in mind that the old divines regarded the Church in the light of a republic; and we all know what a republic means and where, in that form of government, is the source of authority and power.

BUDEUS. (*Review.*)

This theologian says: "To the teachers of the Church or men of the sacred order are assigned justly by a very manifest reason those things which pertain to the more accurate examination into the attainments and gifts of [candidates]. For to this they are believed to be fitted beyond others, as they greatly surpass others both in learning and in experience in spiritual things. And thus the case should be. Sometimes indeed it may happen, that those who are not in the sacred order are, if not by their knowledge of divine things, yet certainly by their wisdom and ability of judging concerning the gifts and talents of others, greatly superior to their pastors. But since the presumption is in favor of the sacred order, the usage prevails that the examination, as it is called or investigation of attainments and gifts is committed to it."

What can be more consistent with the principle of Lutheran polity and the distinction between the right and the

exercise of the right, than this quotation. It says nothing about the authority of the ministry alone to elect and ordain, but on the contrary speaks of the fitness, competency and usage, quietly all the way through intimating that the authority and the right of "calling ministers" is vested in the whole Church. It speaks of certain things being assigned to the teachers of the Church, not belonging to them alone by right. But if certain things, such as examination and ordination are assigned to the teachers of the Church, who assigns them? God? No, not directly, if the principle which Lutherans hold be true. Who, then, assigns these things to the sacred teachers? The irresistible answer according to Lutheranism is, the whole Church.

QUENSTEDT. (*Review.*)

This divine says: "Each part of the Church has its own duties in the calling of ministers. It is the part of ministers to examine the candidates for the ministry, to inquire into their learning and life, to ascertain and judge the gifts necessary to the ministerial office, and to ordain them by the laying on of hands."

Quenstedt speaks here of the duty or part of ministers to examine and ordain by the laying on of hands. But who imposes this duty or assigns this part to the ministry? The Head of the Church? No, for the Lutheran principle holds that God has given the authority to elect and ordain to the whole Church. Therefore, since Quenstedt vindicates this right of the whole Church, he means to say that the whole Church assigns this special part to the ministry. Hence he is logically consistent; otherwise he would not be.

GERHARD. (*Review.*)

This Theologian says: "Nevertheless they so regulated their exercise, that certain parts they did not themselves touch, but left to the ministers of the Church, as the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments, the power of the keys, the examination of those to be elected as ministers and their ordination, etc."

The general principle of Lutheran polity peeps out in every clause of this passage. They left to the ministers

what? The part that Quenstedt speaks of. Gerhard says that they left certain duties to the ministry; then of course they must have had authority over them or else they could not have made any disposition of these certain parts. This divine further says: "To the ministry that it may examine into the doctrine and qualifications of the person to be elected: to the people, that being examined by the ministry, they may hear him in a trial sermon and may either by their suffrage proceed to elect, or on account of weighty and sufficient reasons may interpose." By way of introducing what has been quoted, Gerhard says, "that all things should be done decently and in order," and hence "we assign to the ministry, &c." For the sake of decency and order he says, "we assign to the ministry, the examination of candidates for the ministry." There is nothing here about authority vested solely in the ministry; for if there were, Gerhard would have involved himself in a contradiction, because he maintained the right of the whole Church to call men to the ministry. If now it will be remembered that it was a practice in the Church in those days to have the candidate, after being examined, to preach a sermon before the people, and that then afterward he was ordained to the sacred office, by the laying on of the hands of the ministry, there will be no difficulty in apprehending what Gerhard means, when he says: "to the people, that after being examined by the ministry, they may hear him in a trial sermon and may either by their suffrage proceed to elect, or, on account of weighty and sufficient reasons, interpose." Interpose for what? Becoming their pastor? Be it so. In that case was he then and there ordained? Gerhard by no means says so. The inference is plain. If for weighty and sufficient reasons the Church refused to elect a candidate for the ministry as pastor, his ordination did not then and there take place; for the reason that the Bishops were not authorized by the vote of the people to ordain him. The election of a candidate as pastor was simply the order of the Church to ordain. Bearing this in mind, the statement of the old theologians, that the ministry examined the candidate and ordained, and that the people

consented, voted, and approved, becomes very clear. All this is in perfect harmony, moreover, with the first ecclesiastical Constitution produced by the Reformation, in which it is said: "Let the faithful assemble and choose their own bishops or presbyters and deacons. Each Church should elect its own pastor."

"Let those who are *elected bishops* be consecrated to their office by the imposition of the hands of three bishops; and as for the deacons, if there are no ministers present, let them receive the laying on of hands from the elders of the Church."

By way of further evidence on this point, it is sufficient to remember what is said in the Smalcald Articles immediately following the quotation already made from that source, where it is stated that the Church must also have power to choose and ordain ministers.

"The common usage of the Church likewise proves this; for in former times the people elected clergymen and bishops, then the bishop living in or near the same place came and confirmed those elected by the laying on of hands; and at that time ordination was nothing else than this approbation."

The relation between choosing and ordaining ministers as apprehended by the theologians who subscribed to the Smalcald Articles, is clearly indicated in the passage just cited. According to their opinion ordination followed election by the people; and hence we are forced to conclude that if for sufficient reasons the people interposed, or in other words the election did not take place, there was also in that case no ordination. Enough, perhaps, has now been offered to show what the old theologians meant, when they spoke of the ministry examining candidates, and ordaining; of the people consenting, voting and approving. Beyond a doubt they wished to be understood as saying, that while for the sake of order and propriety, and on account of fitness, the duty of examining and ordaining belonged to the presbytery, yet at the same time it just as properly, and by right belonged to the people, or as we would put it, the whole Church, to say who shall be ordained. But in order to show still further that this is not a groundless supposition, it may

be well to make additional reference to Schmid. In his outline of the topic, "The Church," on page 622, he says:

"This office is, therefore, one of divine appointment, and God has at times himself called single individuals into it, while now he does it only mediately, namely, through the Church, which has received from him the right and authorization to do it. Individual teachers now must, therefore, have received their call and authorization from the Church, if they are to have legitimately the right to teach and administer the Sacraments. It confers their office upon them, moreover, by the solemn rite of ordination. \* \* \* With ordination the Church commits to them the obligation and right to preach the Word of God. \* \* \* The Church expects from each one to whom she intrusts this power, and to whom she then obediently subjects herself, that he perform all his duties with fidelity, and has the right, if he fail to do this, to discipline him."

The foregoing indicates how Schmid understood the old Theologians on the present question. His judgment of their views is simply that the Church has received from God the "right and authorization to call men to the ministry, and to confer on them the sacred office." But if the old dogmatists meant to say in their remarks on this topic that the right to call men to the ministry and to ordain them belongs to the ministry as a ministry, and that hence the people can have no part or lot in this business on any ground of authority or right, if this is what they meant to say, then certainly Schmid radically mistook their judgment. But since we have no reason to conclude that he was a man of weak understanding, we must, to say the least, infer that those old theologians had a very unfortunate and ambiguous way of expressing their thoughts. For when they all in substance claim that the right to call or appoint ministers belongs to the whole Church, and yet at the same time meant by the whole Church only the ministry, they could not have understood the force of words. But no such reflection on their intellectual understanding can be for a moment entertained. These men said precisely what they meant, and meant what

they said. When they spoke of the whole Church, they referred to the congregation of the Saints, and in no wise fixed their thoughts, thereby on some adjunct, office, or instrument of the Church. But then while they were careful to set forth positively and clearly the great principle of Lutheran polity, viz: that the keys have been given to the whole Church, and hence the power to appoint ministers is vested in the whole Church, while they were careful to insist on this principle, they also explained how this principle could be carried out so that due order and competency would be respected. Hence they say: "It is not intended, therefore, hereby to lay down the law that in practice, all the estates of the Church must participate in the choice of the individual teacher." "We distinguish between the right to call ministers and the exercise of the right." \* \* \* "But the exercise of the right varies, according to the diverse agreement and custom of the particular Church."

But in a still more and explicit manner Baier, in his "Compend of Positive Theology," states precisely the view that the writer and his colleagues maintain. After having said that both the ministry and the people take part in the business of making ministers, he proceeds to explain the order, by saying that the Ministerium examines, and then ordains the person designated or chosen, doing both, however, in the name of the Church, (*quod quidem utrumque agit nomine ecclesiae*), since the authority has been granted it by the Church, (*Nempe potestate ab ecclesiae sibi concessa*). Of the people he says,

"That they usually assent to the judgment of the ministry concerning the qualifications of the person to be elected, and together with the Ministerium designate or choose the person for the sacred office; and thus by unanimous consent or agreement the Church bestows the authority to preach the Word, and administer the Sacraments, on the person elected."\*

Baier plainly says, that the Ministerium ordains, but also

---

\* *Secularis ordo fere in judicio ecclesiastici ordinis de personae habilitate acquiescit. \* \* Idem una cum ordine ecclesiastico junctim designat, sive eligit personam ad ministerium, atque ita unanimi con-*

just as plainly remarks that it performs this solemn rite in the name of the Church, positively stating by way of explanation that the authority to do this is granted by the Church to the Ministerium. Then he adds, that the people together with the Ministerium, determines whether the candidate shall be ordained, and that afterwards, in accordance with the unanimous agreement of both orders, the ceremony of ordination is performed.

In the article of the last REVIEW on this subject, special attention is called to the supposed fact, that the doctrine of the universal priesthood of believers, and the consequent right and duty of the whole to participate in the calling of ministers, have nothing to do with this question. The reason for such assertion is, "that Luther and Lutheran authorities can just as well be quoted to prove the duty of the whole Church to preach the Gospel and to labor in every way to extend the kingdom of Christ." That is, since these authorities can be quoted to prove the duty of the whole Church to preach the Gospel and to labor in every way to extend the Redeemer's kingdom, but since that at the same time they did not mean that every Christian could arrogate to himself the office of the ministry, therefore the universal priesthood and the right and duty of the whole Church to participate in the calling of ministers have no bearing on the question as to where is vested the authority to say who shall fill the ministerial office. The defect of the argument is plain; there is an unbridged road between the premises and the conclusion. If it is true that every Christian in a certain sense should preach the Gospel, does it hence follow that the whole Church has no part in the choosing of men to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments. The universal priesthood is very prominently involved in this discussion for the simple reason that the whole authority has been given not to any accident or quality of the body of Christ, but to the body, and this body is the universal priesthood. Dr. Martensen, an emi-

---

sensu potestatem docendi verbum et sacramenta administrandi confert personae electae. Part III., Cap. xiv.



nent Lutheran divine, in his Christian Dogmatics, speaking of ordination, says:

"The special offices of the priesthood are in the Romish Church considered to form the fundamental and original stem which bears the general priesthood as branches. Hence the strongly defined line of demarcation between the *clerici* and the *laici*, the priesthood considering itself to be exclusively the Church, and regarding the laity as an appendage merely. Thus the scriptural and primitive relationship is manifestly disturbed and reversed. It is really the general priesthood of believers which gives birth to the special, and the apostles themselves must have been disciples or Christians before they could become apostles or overseers of the Christian community. \* \* \* We therefore must allow that both the preaching of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments may be carried on in the time of need by unordained men in virtue of that general priesthood with which they were ordained in baptism, and that in the case of need, the Church must have power to ordain their ministers through the oldest of their lay members, if they are not in a position to obtain ministers who have already been ordained. What is here said of the power and authority to preach and administer the Sacraments, namely, *that it is deposited by the congregation to the preacher* is true also of the keys."

Attention is specially called to the fact that the theologians of the Reformation period in advocating the universal priesthood, or that the power to call, elect and ordain ministers, by the whole Church, were only exposing the false assumptions of the papal hierarchy, and that they by no means designed to set forth the doctrine that all authority has been given to the whole Church irrespective of any office; and that on the ground of propriety and fitness, ordination, for example, has been left by the whole Church to the ministry. By insisting on the doctrine of the universal priesthood those old theologians intended merely to resist the exclusive claim of the Romish Bishops to make ministers, and send them where they pleased; and hence all that those divines say on the general priesthood, has no bearing whatever on the present question. If this assertion be true, it can be reasonably inquired, why did the old Lutheran divines in opposing the claim of the Romish Bishops to make ministers,

regardless of the voice of the Church, urge, as their unanswerable argument, the priesthood of all believers? It is admitted that the argument was sound as put forth against the pretended right of the Catholic Bishops. But if it was valid as used against them it surely must have at least some force in the question, as to whether the right of making ministers is vested exclusively in the office of the ministry. What the old divines designed to express most emphatically by the universal priesthood was, that the bishops had no right to set apart any man to the sacred office unless in some way he was authorized to do so by the whole Church. If then the absurdity of this claim on the part of the Bishops was unanswerably proved by the priesthood of all believers, equally as much is the absurdity of this claim, when put forth by the whole special priesthood, exposed on the same ground. The right of the ministry to make preachers, to preach the Word and administer the Sacraments was not disputed by the Lutheran Theologians of the Reformation period, provided it was understood that this right is an authority deputed to them by the whole Church. And now if this is the view that both parties in the General Synod have on the Ministerium, then there certainly is no actual difference of judgment. The advocates of the so-called non-Ministerium side do not deny the propriety, fitness or superior competency of the ministry to examine and ordain; neither do they dispute that it is the duty of the ministry to perform this work; but simply hold that it is a duty imposed on the ministry by the consent of the whole. They do not propose to set aside a long established custom, or reverse a time-honored practice or un-Lutheranize the General Synod. On the contrary, they mean to be true to the great principle of Lutheran polity; they mean to say that ministers should continue to examine and ordain; they mean simply to uphold the true doctrine with respect to Church authority. With Luther they most heartily say "we have not made all laymen, bishops, priests, and ecclesiastics." It is quite a misapprehension to suppose that they desire to have laymen officiate in ordination, when they contend that the right to

call, elect, and ordain ministers is with the whole Church. The assertion consequently that their view is "at variance with the whole history and practice of the Lutheran Church," is not well founded. Because "the Church presents as her faith and practice the examination and ordination of ministers by ministers," it does by no means follow that God has not vested all authority in the Church, and that consequently she does not claim the right to examine and ordain ministers by ministers to be deputed to them by her. But if this view of the so-called non-Ministerium party is not approved by the opposite side, then the question fairly stated is, Has God committed the right to make ministers mediately through the whole Church to the presbytery, or has he, independently of the whole Church vested this right in the ministerial office? If the latter judgment is the one which the opponents of the writer's side of the house are maintaining, then the arguments of episcopacy, either in its extreme or modified forms, are their best hold. With them in that event the inquiry cannot be, what is the distinctive Lutheran view on this question; for there could be no distinctive view as to principle. In regard to practice, in this also the Lutheran Church does not differ materially from the Reformed or Presbyterian Church, but she does disagree from her materially in principle; the latter holding that God has directly given the presbytery exclusive authority to call, elect, and ordain ministers, while the former claims that God has given this authority to the whole Church; and that the exercise of it in part is left to the ministry. It is proper to repeat, that if the theory is maintained that the Head of the Church has invested the ministerial office with the function of ordaining or making ministers independently of the congregation of the Saints, then the Presbyterian doctrine, to put the case in its mildest form, has found earnest defenders in the General Synod. With the Reformed Church, the presbytery is the body of primary power, and whatever voice the Church may have in these matters now being discussed, she has solely by the sufferance of the elders. This kind of ecclesiastical polity, it hence will be readily perceived, is the exact reverse

of that to which the Evangelical Lutheran Church adheres. The writer and his colleagues are stoutly opposed to any thing that smacks of Presbyterian polity, or that is colored in any wise by the shadows of episcopacy. They can hence honestly aver, their non-intention either to tinker at or alter the practice of the Lutheran Church, and much less to tinker at and alter the distinctive principle of her government. Let it be distinctly understood, that they are not aiming to introduce changes into the present mode of government or to abolish the practice of three hundred years; but they design simply to call the attention of ministry and laity to the primary source of authority in all ecclesiastical affairs.

This whole matter must be viewed in the light of the principle of Lutheran Church polity; namely, The authority of the whole Church to elect and ordain ministers. This must be the beginning middle and end of the whole doctrine on this subject. Every view must be consistent with this principle, or else there will be contradiction; for this principle is the very marrow of Lutheran Church government. In connection with this, it is of the utmost importance to hold clearly in view the distinction between the right and the exercise of the right; and in doing so, it will promote distinctness to maintain with the old Theologians that the Church is a Christian republic. If the principle of Lutheran polity is admitted on both sides, and the question be whether the ministry *may* exercise the right of examining and ordaining ministers, then there can be no debate. Because, according to the doctrine of the authority of the whole Church, and the distinction between the right and the exercise of it, the ministry alone may perform these duties. It would be in perfect harmony with the doctrine, that the whole Church has the authority to elect and ordain ministers, if every Synod in the General Synod had a Ministerium, provided this doctrine were properly recognized. The question, therefore, cannot be, Ministerium or no Ministerium; but where in the Church, that is outside its Head, is the ultimate source of all authority? And to this question Lutherans are able to give but one answer: The whole Church.

## ARTICLE VI.

## THE THEOLOGY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY.

Translated from Harless' *Zeitschrift für Protestantismus und Kirche* (32nd vol. New Series, p. 25).

By Rev. A. MARTIN, Professor in Pennsylvania College.

At the close of our first article "*on the theology of the seventeenth century*," we referred to the three great tendencies of the same, which from the places of their origin we designate as, 1st that of Helmstädt, 2nd that of Wittenberg, and 3rd that of Jena. If we said that they have a certain similarity to the tendencies of the present, we meant this, of course, only respecting their general outlines by which they are characterized, and this also only in respect to their theological peculiarities. For we have to do only with the theology of the seventeenth century. The diversity of those three chief tendencies (*Grundrichtungen*) appears more clearly in their respective apprehension of *the relation of theology to the Confessions of the Church*, which then reacts upon the significance which they vindicate for the ecclesiastical Confession itself in its relation to the Church. And since the former is conditioned by the latter, we are constrained to discuss it, at least so far as is necessary for the right understanding of this three-fold form of the theology of which we speak.

The tendency proceeding from Helmstädt, and represented by Calixt, Hornejus, Dreier, Latermann, resembles the modern Unionistic theology of our times, as it asserts itself as well without as within the dominion of the Union. It is the same tendency to union between the separate churches, the same depreciation of the significance of the ecclesiastical confession and of the confessional differences for church-fellowship. It is a similar distinction between fundamentals and non-fundamentals, between essentials and non-essentials,

between that which belongs to the church and that which belongs to the theological school: a similar depreciation of the Lutheran Confessions, and especially the same laudation of toleration and clemency, the same lamentation respecting the division of those who are nevertheless agreed in the fundamentals of the faith. It sounds almost as coming from the very heart of the present, when Calixt says:

"I must confess, and I confess it willingly and gladly, that ever since I have been able to contemplate it rightly, it has pained me heartily and more than I can tell in words, that those who are baptized in the name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, who believe that the only Almighty Creator of heaven and earth is Father Son and Holy Ghost, that the only begotten Son of the Father, for the sake of us men, and to save us from sin, death and damnation, took upon himself human nature, suffered and died, rose from the dead and ascended into heaven, sitting on the right hand of God, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead; that meanwhile upon his command the Gospel is preached, and all who believe the same constitute one holy Church and congregation, well-pleasing unto God, in which is forgiveness of sin; that the dead will arise in their own bodies, and those which have done good shall go into everlasting life, and those which have done evil shall go into eternal fire; that those who firmly believe this, are severed in irreconcilable hatred and enmity through mutual condemnation and making each other out heretics. (Verketzern and Verdammen).

"Those who firmly believe these great truths, and live not after the flesh, but chaste, righteous and godly lives in this present world, and do nothing against their consciences, neither affirm nor deny, although in some matters and in excited questions they may not accurately hit the right, who make use of the Holy Supper as it is administered to them, and think that they are right, I cannot by myself determine differently, but that they are Christians, and accordingly are worthy that one meet them with Christian love and friendliness.

"This I mention, so that it may be perceived, that salvation depends on what has just been said, and who thus believes and lives is not to be rejected from the number of Christians."\*

---

\* Compare Schmid: *History of Syncretism*, p. 170.

Unquestionably Calixt was perfectly sincere both in this sorrow and in this love. But in this we have also the real nerve of his churchly and theological views. It is the opinion that all that the Christian must believe to be saved is contained in the Apostles' Creed. This symbol is the quintessence of the essential and necessary articles of faith.\* All the rest, whatever was added later in ecclesiastical determinations (Bestimmungen), in symbolical articles of doctrine, is nothing more than fuller and more accurate explanations of the old, fundamental Confession, expansions which had indeed become necessary on account of the manifold heresies, but added no new knowledge of saving truth, expressed no real enriching of the common faith of the Church.† The difference between these later symbolical determinations and the Apostles' Creed is only in the form. The essential contents of the faith are already entirely and completely comprehended in the latter. Whatever transcends that has significance for the office of teaching, but not for the congregation. It serves for the explanation and defence of the common faith of the Church, but does not affect the substance of the same.

Because the Apostles' Creed expresses in short, simple sentences all that is necessary to salvation, because it contains the *fundamentum fidei*, it is a perfectly sufficient foundation of church fellowship. Nothing more is required. And since all Christian Churches adhere to it, and are thus agreed in *fundamento fidei et salutis*, the desired unity, the unity of *one spiritual* body really exists and requires only to be brought again into recognition. It is not denied that there are great and deeply penetrating differences in doctrine and in the sacraments which at present separate the Confessions and make a union impossible. Calixt says rightly: "Better an open acknowledgment of that which separates, than a hypocritical

---

\* Continet summam totius doctrinæ apostolicæ, cuius adulto et rationis compoti ad salutem necessariæ.

† Credenda quæ salvificam fidem constituunt, successu temporum vel additamentis posteriorum non multiplicantur aut crescent.



concealment of the dissension under ambiguous formulæ." But all those errors of which the Christian communions mutually accuse each other, lie without the domain of the necessary articles of faith, and do not therefore destroy the existing communion (the *communio virtualis et interna*—the true Christian brotherhood).

We have therefore apparently just as simple as firm a basis for a union; in reality it already exists; and the question is only to make it effectual. And in this also the School of Helmstädt makes the attempt. It seeks namely to show how even the dissension which exists alongside of the existing unity between Catholics, Lutherans and Reformed is by no means so thoroughgoing and penetrating as is usually supposed: already because it does not affect the foundation of faith and salvation (*fundamentum fidei et salutis*); and furthermore because it lies more in the forms of doctrine, than in the thing itself. The real difference between the Lutheran and Catholic churches reduces itself to the doctrine respecting the papacy and the pope (whose unchristian presumption of authority Calixt contests with energy), and to the doctrines of the sacraments, together with the false practices connected therewith. On the other hand, the remainder of the disputed doctrines, particularly of original sin and of justification, if one disregards that which is unessential and merely scholastic, can be reduced to a simple and general expression in which both could recognize their common faith. As the Lutheran Church contains essentially nothing else in its Confessions, than what the ancient Church already taught (for the additions do not affect the faith necessary to salvation), so in reality the Catholic Church wishes the same thing, and the only mistake, though very reprehensible, is that the Council of Trent, in its doctrine of justification, not only determined more definitely points which previously were controverted, and until then had been considered indifferent, but pronounced its anathema against the opposite (relatively more correct) opinions. But as respects the relation of the Lutheran Church to the Reformed, the doctrine of predestination of the latter, although erroneous in its development,

does not change the common foundation of the faith. But the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity is new, and hence not necessary. And thus there remains really only the difference respecting the Lord's Supper in which indeed the Reformed Church errs radically. But however great the error, it does not exclude from salvation, especially if not maintained against better knowledge, and is therefore no reason for refusing brotherly Christian intercourse to the Reformed.

We see the endeavor of Calixt is to diminish as much as possible the differences between the separated churches. He partly places the diverging doctrines of the other Confessions in the most favorable light, and partly, at least, seeks to excuse them, while he lightly esteems the prerogatives of his own. For according to this position, the latter has nothing essentially different from the former, and what separates it from them are not to be considered fundamental errors nor real heresies, but only such points as have no decisive importance for the salvation of man, do not belong to the substance of the faith, but fall into the domain of theological development and elucidation.

With all this the so-called syncretism stands evidently in direct opposition to the fundamental principles of the Lutheran Church. It disputes her right in that in which she has hitherto placed her legitimacy and her glory, that she is the Church of the Scriptural Confession, it disparages her confessional peculiarities, while on the one hand it denies the radical significance of those errors undermining the foundation which she fought hitherto with so great zeal, and in opposition to which she has developed her doctrinal conception—and on the other hand it traduces just that which she esteems her palladium and her highest prestige: the new knowledge of saving truth which she possesses in the article of justification, and what is connected with the same, in the true doctrine of sin and grace, of the person of Christ and the sacraments, to insignificance for the saving faith, yes even to mere *theologoumena*; for just their peculiarity, the conception in which they especially belong to the Lutheran Church, appears as unessential, as indifferent, while that

which is *substantial* belongs also to the other church-communions, because already contained in the Apostles' Creed.

Thus this tendency, if not entirely, yet for the most part, obliterates the distinction hitherto held fast in the Church between the Confession of the Church and that which belongs to the Theological School. It vindicates the right for itself to call again in question those points of the faith respecting which the Church has already come to a symbolical conclusion, and to revise the entire *status confessionis*. It attempts this especially in the way of historical investigation, but partly also in an exegetical way. And just here, notwithstanding the erroneous attitude towards the Confession, and many undeniable deteriorations of the doctrinal system of the Church, especially of the doctrine of justification and of sin, it has undeniable advantages—the endeavor along side of the differences to bring to recognition also that which is common, the going back to Christian antiquity, especially the mind for the historical continuity of the faith, for the churchly tradition, and in general the love and diligence with which it turns to the neglected study of history. On the other hand, it disrupts the hereditary dogmatico-exegetical tradition, especially the erroneous procedure which pretends to find the dogmas of the Church, not only in substance, but also in form in the Holy Scriptures. It particularly contests the importation of the explicit dogma of the Trinity into the Old Testament—only vestiges of it are found therein. And so it can in general be said, the defect of this tendency is its attitude to the Confessions of the Church: its advantages are in the distinction between churchly confession and dogmatic system, between environment and liberty of theology (of course erroneous in its development).

The direct antithesis of this *Helmstedt tendency* meets us in that of *Wittenberg and Leipsic*, with Calov at its head. As lax as is the former in its relation to the Confessions of the Church with so decisive and unchangeable firmness does the latter hold fast to it, and indeed in all its individual declarations, as in its general force. To yield even an iota of it was regarded as treason to the Church. From this standpoint, it

recognizes in syncretism a highly serious heresy, in opposition to the inmost essence of the Lutheran Church; and exerts all its powers in refutation of the same. And with this view nearly all Lutheran theologians—even those of Jena—agree essentially, aside from the mode and manner of the contest. But those of Wittenberg deserve the credit of having stripped syncretism of its deceptive appearance in which it veiled itself, and of having clearly presented its relation to the principles of the Lutheran Church, and fully exhibited all its consequences. Step by step they follow it and attempt its refutation. And in this attempt they (especially Calov) evince not only a theological erudition which fully equals that of their famous opponent, but also a discernment of the real question, an accuracy in determining the *status controversiæ*, which inspire all possible respect. That at least has been my experience—who set out, with most decided repugnance, yea with peculiar antipathy, to read the “*considerationem novæ theologiæ Helmstædtiæ-Regio-Montanorum syncretistarum*,” which Calov appends to the first part of his theological system—that in the main points I was obliged to agree with the acute polemicist, though I could not approve the mode and manner of his polemics; and I parted from the work with the impression of real respect.

It is by no means our purpose here to enumerate the points which were arraigned against syncretism, inasmuch as in the progress of this article we shall indicate at least those points in which the entire Lutheran Church was united against it. For we are engaged now only with the characteristics of the theology which made war upon it. And here we are obliged to say especially, that in *thesi* this theology maintained the Protestant principles respecting the relation of Scripture and tradition much more correctly than the opponents. Yet in this respect it may be called the more free. For it is so far from abandoning the normative authority of the Scriptures, that it enforces the same with the greatest possible emphasis against the importance which Calixt vindicates to the *consensus* of Christian antiquity. It decidedly rejects his proposition that “tradition is to be considered *principium secun-*

*darium* alongside of the Scriptures (*principium primum*).” Only to the latter belongs the dignity of principle; the opposite view denies its proper authority. And remarkably enough, even into the principle of historic development of the Christian faith this rigidly Lutheran school has a more correct insight than Calixt, who is deservedly famous for his historic mind and penetration. For while the latter ascribes only formal significance to the entire work of the Church in the formation of dogmas, and regards all ecclesiastical declarations which transcend the Apostles’ Creed, only as more minute doctrinal explanations and safeguards of the substance of the Christian faith already fully comprehended in that symbol, the former shows on the contrary, that all symbols have in general only the purpose of expressing the contents of the Christian faith in reference to certain historical heresies, and thus only in those directions from which it is endangered: and that accordingly the Apostles’ Creed contains by no means all the fundamental articles, but on the contrary, in the farther course of history, in opposition to other heresies, other articles of faith were made prominent and determined more definitely, down to the Lutheran Confessions. He has thus the idea of a *development* which sets forth a really new knowledge of saving truth: the idea of a real progress of the Church, by which, as he himself acknowledges, even the original forms in which the Church possessed the substance of the faith, has suffered many a change. It must be confessed that this view is historically the more correct, and as one might say again, that it is also the more Protestant—as in general the Wittenbergians far more decidedly subject the entire churchly tradition of Christian antiquity to the decision of the Scriptures, than Calixt does. That in opposition to him, they enforce with great emphasis the radical significance of all errors which the Lutheran Church rejects, and the fundamental force of all the doctrines which she confesses, that they severely criticise especially the subordination of the article of justification as the “*articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae*,” as well as every other deviation from the doctrinal system of the Church, is a matter of course. Nor

can it be said forthwith, that they employ the Confessions only as an external law, for they continually carry on their proof with arguments from the Scriptures and the testimony of history—nevertheless here is the shady side of this orthodox school. In the first place, they make no distinction whatever between what is fundamental and non-fundamental, but place every thing in which their opponents seem to err in the former point of view, no matter how far remote from the centre of the faith. And just so little do they distinguish between what is substance and essence of the Confession, and what are merely theological disquisitions in the symbolical books, but urge their entire contents without distinction, in refutation of their opponents. Furthermore, they do not distinguish between the form and the thought of the symbolical declarations, but adhere rigidly to the literalness of the former, without inquiring whether the opponents have not the right understanding of the matter in another form. And finally, they place the entire system of orthodox dogmatics, in every particular, on the same line with the Confessions of the Church, so that they stigmatize as heresy every deviation from the former—even every deviation from the traditional interpretation of isolated passages of Scripture, and vindicate symbolical obligation for every dogmatic proposition to which the Helmstädtians take exception, even to such as in their nature belong among theological problems.

This lamentable error reaches its zenith in the notorious "*Consensus repetitus*," which may safely be regarded as the creed of the school. There we read for instance on Art. III. of the Augustana, after the leading propositions of the Athanasian Creed are first cited:

"We reject those who teach, that it is enough to believe that there is one God, who is Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and that what must be believed, those peculiar, and in an accurate understanding, so-called articles of faith (on account of the ignorance of which the ignorant are excluded from the knowledge of salvation), do not include the *notionis divinae proprietates et relationes*, that is, the peculiar characteristics as well of the true divinity, as the special attributes

and relations of these divine persons to each other—how namely one person is distinguished from another and even from the divine essence itself—either in a particular manner, or in some measure which the human understanding can regard in a special manner, or in some other mode or manner:—yea, also teach that the Son of God, who is one God with the Father, was by believers in the Old Testament, revered and worshipped in one and the same essence without clear and plain discernment of the distinction of persons.”

And in the same connection:

“We reject those who teach, that the mystery of the Holy Trinity was indeed in a certain measure known to the patriarchs and prophets by special revelation of God, but is by no means so presented in the Old Testament that it could then be understood by every one, or that it could be so understood now, except by addition of the New Testament, and that the clear and distinct faith of three persons in one divine essence was not necessary to salvation in the times of the Old Testament.”

And in the sequel:

“We reject those who teach, that in the books of the Old Testament, which the prophets wrote moved by the Holy Ghost, are found rather vestiges, than clear and plain testimonies assuring the human heart, or that the mystery of the Holy Trinity is rather remotely indicated, than plainly and clearly revealed and presented.”

Yet even the proposition is set up:

“We confess and teach, that the Son of God who in his own proper person appeared of old to the fathers, is not only directly called *angel*, Ex. 23 : 20, (which the apostle Paul refers to Christ, 1 Cor. 10 : 9,) and Hosea 12 : 4, 5; but also the *angel of the Lord*, Gen. 16 : 7; Ex. 3 : 2; Judg. 6 : 11, 12; and the *angel of God*. Gen. 31 : 11, 13. Compare C. 18. 20. and Ex. 14 : 19. \* \* \* “He is also called the *angel before his face*, Is. 63 : 9, and the *angel of the covenant*, Mal. 3 : 2.”

And the sentence of rejection is hurled:

“We reject those who deny that the Son of God ever appeared in his own proper person before his incarnation, and that the same is anywhere called an *angel* except in two places, Is. 9 : 6, and Mal. 3 : 1.”



So we have further with Art. III. the view shared by so many orthodox theologians, that Christ descended into hell "*according to the Spirit*," designated as a reprobate error. In connection with Art. IV., not only the churchly explanation of the term "*Justification*," is received into the Confession, but those are rejected who in 1 Cor. 6 : 11, and Tit. 3 : 7, take the word in any but a forensic sense. And again it is said :

"We reject those who teach, that respecting the Lord's Supper and what is received therein, and for what purpose it is received, it is written in the 6th chapter of the gospel of St. John, in such plain, clear and explicit words, so that if any one wished purposely to speak very plainly respecting the Lord's Supper, he could not make it more clear."

*Compare on the Article of the Lord's Supper :*

"We reject those who teach that Christ presents his body in the Holy Supper by means of a peculiar divine power, and not by means of the power which Christ in his human nature has received through the personal union (of human and divine)."

All these, in part, purely exegetical assertions and negations appear on a level with the fundamental articles of faith. The same sentence which is passed upon the corruption of the doctrine of original sin, is pronounced upon the theory of creation, which even Augustine declared a theological problem. The same sentence of rejection which is hurled against the mutilation and deterioration of the doctrine of justification, passes upon the most insignificant deviation in the form of presentation. While again the thesis to be confessed is often presented in the scholastic form of dogmatics, instead of the words of the Confession. And what is worse, this entire sum of positive and negative propositions, this specific Wittenberg dogmatic is to be raised as *the law of faith* for the whole Church, or rather forced upon it as such. Just herein we discern what is false and unprotestant in the Wittenberg School. Not that it contends for orthodoxy with the exertion of all its powers, but that it treats of the faith of the Church as a sum of individual dogmatic propositions, and undertakes to enforce them as a law ; not that it holds

so inflexibly to the Confessions, but that it erases the dividing line between the Confessions and Theology, that it entirely overlooks the difference between articles of faith and scientific problems, between fundamentals and unessentials. Herein is its error and perversity, and herein also it is only the opposite extreme of the Calixtine tendency, which likewise identifies the substance of the Confessions with theologoumena, although in the opposite sense.

Then follows yet the evil inclination to multiply the errors of the opponents, to draw from their propositions a series of conclusions which they do not acknowledge, and by force of new deductions from these conclusions to stamp them as offences against the Confessions. And then is added the utter disinclination to seek an understanding with the dissenters, and the entire disregard of that which yet unites the two contending parties, and is common to them both. The eye is fixed only on that which separates, only upon the antithesis, the purpose is only to convict the opponents of apostacy from the pure doctrine, and one sees in the other Confession only the heresy. From this standpoint, the difference between the Lutheran and Reformed Churches is not only widened as far as possible, but also every manifestation within our own Church which deviates from the hereditary forms of the Schools is viewed with suspicion, every tendency either more liberal or laying more stress upon the internals of Christianity is regarded as questionable. Even in J. Arndt, in H. Mueller dangerous elements are found, and in *Spener* the Wittenberg Faculty discovers the well known 263 errors.

With all this, notwithstanding its great merits in behalf of the Church, this tendency has become a signal of warning for the future. If it had attained to absolute dominion, it would have put an end to Protestant Theology. From the principle, "*we are finished in doctrine*," it must have fallen into deadly stagnation.

Between it and the School of Helmstedt stands a third, which has its head-quarters in Jena, and its most prominent

representatives in Solomon Glassius and John Musaeus, but includes distinguished theologians of other Universities. It is not less true to the Confessions than those of Wittenberg, with them it opposes those of Helmstädt, but keeps at a distance from the false extremes of both. From its lips we shall be most pleased to hear how syncretism was considered from a Lutheran standpoint, and what was opposed to it. They proceed at once from the difference between the real articles of faith, and questions which hover about the faith. This distinction, they say, is determined quite differently by Lutherans and Reformed. While both are agreed in the principle that church fellowship is only possible on the ground of unity in the faith, the Reformed reckon all controverted points and questions between themselves and the Lutherans among unessentials, while the Lutherans maintain that they affect the doctrine of faith itself; and therefore refuse them church-fellowship. The question is, whether rightly? The answer appears from the proper determination of what is fundamental.

Fundamentum fidei is that upon which the faith rests, (*id quod in fidei structura primum est et a quo fides oritur et quo nitetur*)—that which is first in the structure of the faith and from which faith arises or by which it shines—it is, more accurately speaking, the doctrine concerning Christ—in other words, Christ known by the intellect and set forth in words so as to be known by others; for “Christ preached” is both the object and ground of faith. But the doctrine concerning Christ comprehends the entire divinely revealed doctrine of salvation, not one or another part of it, but the entire divinely revealed doctrine for the edification of the faith.\* The single points of this doctrine of salvation which are all in organic unity, are the *articles of the faith*: they are all fundamental articles, because they are essential for producing and maintaining the faith. Of course, this their relation to the faith differs, is either closer or more remote, either direct,

---

\*Tota ad fidei edificationem divinitus patefacta doctrina.

or more or less indirect. Some are so constituted that they cannot be ignored by any one, faith and salvation being safe,\* and others so that they cannot be disputed without danger to salvation, because they are most intimately connected with the former, nevertheless they are to be reckoned to the necessary articles of faith. Herewith the main questions in which the syncretistic movement was concerned, are decided. It is decided that neither the Apostles' Creed, nor the symbolical determinations of the first five centuries can be regarded as a complete foundation of the faith. It is decided that the Church has no authority to yield anything whatever of the knowledge of saving truth which she has received through the grace of God, nor to reduce the same to a narrower sphere for the sake of a false peace of the Church, under the pretext that they are not absolutely necessary to salvation for the simple Christian, (1074 sq.)

"Cause of it is this: God has entrusted to his Church, as the spiritual mother of all his believing children, not only those chief articles of the true Christian doctrine which it is necessary for every simple minded person to believe; and without the knowledge and acceptance of which the true faith cannot be kindled nor preserved in them; but he has entrusted to her the entire Christian doctrine of faith and life, as well as the holy Sacraments, to maintain and preserve them pure and unadulterated, to defend them against all seducing spirits, to make faithful use of the same to bring forth and nurture spiritual children to God, that in blessed knowledge of the truth they may grow and increase from day to day; to strengthen the weak, to raise up the tempted, to comfort the desponding, to arouse the wicked and carnally secure from their sleep of sin, to set right the erring, to seek the lost, and thus to accomplish most carefully whatever behooves a spiritual mother to accomplish in true children of God upon the earth, and has therefore no power to forego anything or any part of those doctrines which are committed to her for that purpose, and without the full availability of which she cannot perfectly employ and enjoy the office committed to her for the edification of her members, and of the true children of God; but what St. Paul says to his Timo-

---

\* Fide et salute salva a nemine ignorari possunt.

thy: "Take heed to thyself and to the *doctrine*" etc., 1 Tim. 4: 16, 6: 3 sq.; 2 Tim. 3: 11, 1, 13, and 14, he says in Timothy to the entire Christian Church. And what he demands of every bishop, namely, that he hold fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able, by sound doctrine, both to exhort, and to convince the gainsayers, Tit. 1: 9, he demands of all true bishops and faithful teachers. And this is therefore the office of the Church and of her faithful teachers, that they hold fast and immovably, not only to those articles of the Christian doctrine which are necessary for the simple-minded to believe, but also to those which are necessary for true teachers and preachers, in order to instruct others unto salvation: *i. e.* those which are 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction, in righteousness,' as says St. Paul, 2 Tim. 3: 16, and to suffer none to be adulterated or taken away."

"But most of the controversies between our churches and those of the papists, as well as those between ours and the Reformed or Calvinistic churches, have reference to doctrines of this character: as do *e. g.* the controversies respecting justification and the forgiveness of sin, respecting good works and their supposed merit, respecting repentance and its parts, respecting men's own satisfaction for their sins, the only sacrifice of Christ for our sins, and the falsely invented popish sacrifices of the mass, respecting the Sacrament of the Holy Supper and its right use in both elements, respecting the only worship of the true God and of Christ our Lord and Saviour, and the conflicting worship of departed saints, reverence and worship of images and reliques, respecting the Christian Church and its Head and the pope's arrogated supreme power over all the Christian Church and over all temporal kingdoms, and such like things, respecting which there has been controversy this century and a half in our own and the papistical churches. So also respecting the universal grace of God and the universal merit of Christ and God's universal promises of grace founded thereon; respecting the gracious election in Christ, faith in Christ and the reprobation of the unbelieving on account of their unbelief foreseen from eternity, and the opposite doctrine of the election of grace and reprobation by the naked council of God; respecting faith, whether it can be lost, or is actually lost by sins committed against conscience, respecting the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Holy Supper, and such like points of doctrine which are disputed between us and

the Reformed or Calvinistic churches, none of which are questions, whether easy or difficult respecting which it may be disputed for or against, without damage to the true Christian doctrine of faith and life; but are doctrines partly necessary to the kindling and preservation of the true Christianity, partly affecting dangerous and damnable errors detrimental to men's salvation, and leading to superstition or carnal security. And these points are without doubt comprehended in the *doctrine and faithful Word* to which St. Paul so earnestly exhorts his Timothy to hold fast and immovably, and in Timothy all Christian bishops, teachers and preachers. And the errors in question are without doubt of those so 'seducing spirits and doctrines of devils,' of which 'the Spirit hath spoken expressly,' that they should come in the last times, 1 Tim. 4 : 1; and against which St. Paul so faithfully exhorts his Timothy again, to preach the word, to be instant in season and out of season, to reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering and doctrine, 2 Tim. 4 : 2.\*

Thus far the theologians of Jena accord with those of Wittenberg, and in general with all orthodox theologians of the seventeenth century. This is the common view of the Lutheran Church, as it has been maintained from the beginning, and already developed in 1826 by Nicolaus Hunnius.

But when the question now arises to determine the relation of essentials and unessentials, of confession and theology, of environment and freedom in theology, subject to these mutually acknowledged principles and laws, those of Jena strike out in altogether a different road from those of Wittenberg. They censure the unfairness and bitterness of the polemics of the latter, and reject the judicial office which they arrogantly assume, not only respecting doctrines, but also respecting persons. They insist upon the principle that when dissensions arise a final decision can only be reached after full investigations, after fair and careful explanation of the sense and extent of the points of controversy, and then only by agreement of the whole Church, and not by single individuals.

---

\* From the Gutachten of the Faculty of Jena on the "*Consensus repetitus*."

Then they enter upon answering the questions designated. And they first set up the canon (1008—1010):

"It is a far different thing, if a dissension arises among theologians respecting the necessary doctrines of faith, or if only respecting questions of the schools, and side issues. For in the latter case, one can bear with the dissenter, but by no means in the former. But if the true Lutheran doctrine is attacked, contested or adulterated, we are, by virtue of the office we bear, bound to refute the false doctrine, to reprove the gainsayers, and to stop their mouths, Tit. 1 : 11; and finally we must say: 'a man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject' Tit. 3 : 10. However desirable it would be, that also in other questions of the schools, and side issues, they might agree in friendliness, and that the bond of unity between orthodox and pure theologians might be brought to entire perfection, so that according to the exhortation of St. Paul, 1 Cor. 1 : 10, they all speak the same thing and (in all questions) be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment; yet on account of the present imperfection, such a thing is not so easily to be hoped as to be wished, of which our sainted Gerhard writes very admirably, Tom. V., *Loc de Eccl.*, p. 1595: 'It is to be distinguished between absolute unity, perfect and free from all dissension, which will have place at length in the Church triumphant, and fundamental unity, which consists in agreement of the principal articles, although concerning some less important points of the faith, or concerning ceremonies, indifferent things, or even concerning the interpretation of some passages of Scripture, there should be controversy. And such is that unity which has place in the Church militant. For in that so great concord is never found, but it is mixed with some dissension.'"

"The doctrines necessary to salvation must be maintained immovably and unchangeably; and herein it is not allowed or granted to any theologian to make any innovation or change, to exclude or to insert a new article."

"For our souls' salvation and blessedness rest upon the necessary divinely revealed doctrines, all the articles of which are united as the links of a chain, so that none can be changed, adulterated or excluded without violence to the others; and all orthodox and pure theologians must therefore be agreed in the necessary doctrines, and this our sainted



Gerhard calls *unitatem fundamentalem* which has place in the church militant."

"But what respects the clear and full explanation of the necessary doctrines of faith, the interpretation of difficult passages of the Holy Scriptures, philosophical questions which have relation to some articles of faith and their development and application, and what is demanded for the better explanation of the necessary doctrines, what concerns the manner and mode of refuting the gainsayers and of defending the necessary doctrines, and the like, herein even orthodox and pure theologians cannot always be agreed, especially such as are in office in high schools."

"For they are not appointed that they should without further meditation dictate to their hearers or students what they have heard from their preceptors, or have read in other theologians; but that they should well weigh every thing for themselves; where there are difficulties, to endeavor clearly and thoroughly to explain the same, as far as is possible and profitable to them, so that they themselves may grow and increase more and more in knowledge, and also guide and incite their hearers and students to thorough knowledge and understanding, and thus to educate well-trained and thoroughly established theologians who may serve God in high schools and in church with profit; propagate the pure doctrine of faith and its thorough knowledge from time to time to posterity, and defend the same against all heretics."

"If, therefore, sincere and conscientious theologians and professors sustain their office with proper care, how by diligent meditation they may become more and more perfect in theology and attain to better knowledge, and if they are concerned with all anxiety to present theology most clearly and most thoroughly to their hearers, it cannot be otherwise, but that there must sometimes dissensions arise between otherwise orthodox and pure theologians, in the mode of teaching, declaring and defending the doctrine of faith."

This those of Jena prove from the diversity of gifts, from the nature of the Holy Scriptures, and from the history of the ancient, as well as of the Lutheran Church; and from this they draw the conclusion (1013):

"These two parts must therefore be together in the Christian Church, and must be inflexibly maintained; the one,

that the articles of the Christian faith remain unchanged, and are neither increased by new additions, nor diminished by putting off or mutilating one or the other: the other is, that as much as affects the thorough explanation and defence of the true doctrine, the interpretation of difficult passages and the like, the perfecting of religion and the growth of the Christian Church, and especially of its teachers in thorough knowledge of the true doctrine remain free, unhindered and unperverted."

From this follows the necessary application (1013):

"If, therefore, it happens, that theologians are agreed in the true doctrine itself, and as our sainted Gerhard says, are bound to each other in the bond of unity and of peace, as much as concerns the fundamental unity, but are unequal in gifts of heart and mind and in growth in the true knowledge; and in explanation and defence of the true doctrine, one comes nearer the real matter than the other; or even, as they are all men and have human weaknesses, one should mistake and offend; and dissensions therefore arise between theologians, we must not at once proceed with rejections and condemnations, and even severing the bond of unity, but Christian love demands that one instruct the other who is of a different and not well-founded opinion, until God grant him grace to farther understanding and knowledge. Yet far less is it allowable that one arrogate to himself dominion over another, and urge his opinions, perhaps not well founded, with violence upon others against their better knowledge and conscience. For the human understanding cannot be forced with violence, but if it is to be won and brought to a different opinion, it must be done by better information and full instruction, else one would force something upon another, as if it were to be accepted and taught which in his conscience he considers false, which goes against conscience."

Then they show the right of a progressive knowledge of the true doctrine in the Church, of improvement, of development and perhaps correction of the attained position. To deny this right would be nothing less than to forbid self-edification to the Church, which however is the will of God.

But this progress may possibly be legitimate or illegitimate. Respecting this they express themselves thus (1027):

"Although thorough explanations belonging to the growth in the knowledge of the true doctrine, which may not have

been previously known or practiced, but only recently discovered in the Holy Scriptures and brought forth from them, are properly speaking not innovations (for they are founded in the Holy Scriptures, and according to their source, are as old as the Holy Scriptures themselves) yet if every thing is called innovation, which before was not distinctly known and practiced, although new only by reason of the nature of knowledge, but by reason of the substance matter, firmly and well-founded in the Holy Scriptures, and only now expounded and brought forth from them; then those go altogether too far who are unwilling to hear of any innovation in theology; and therefore constantly and often with great impropriety cast about themselves with the reproach of novelty, in the opinion that what is in any wise new, and has not heretofore been so taught and explained as it is now, and might possibly be hereafter, is therefore to be rejected and condemned, and requires no farther in investigation."

"The Christian Church has never been without these so-called innovations or new doctrines which belong to the growth in knowledge, are well-founded in Holy Scripture and have only recently been brought forth therefrom: but as from time to time, by the gifts and assistance of the Holy Spirit, she has grown and increased in thorough knowledge and the defense of divine truth, so also as regards the further exposition of this truth, she has from time to time introduced one so-called innovation after another. For every explanation of some doctrine produced from Holy Scriptures by the talented and spiritual church fathers, which was not previously distinctly known and practiced in the Christian Churches was an innovation at the time when it was produced, which however was not on that account rejected of the Christian Church at the time: but because it was in the analogy of faith, and incited and guided the true believers to better knowledge and understanding in the true doctrine, it was gladly and thankfully accepted. Whence therefore it appears, that not all so-called innovations in theology are to be rejected, nor all to be allowed, but such as are well-founded in Holy Scripture, lead to no change in the doctrine of the faith, but are profitable and necessary to growth in a thorough knowledge of divine truth, to a clear explanation and effective defence of the same, are to be accepted and maintained. But, on the other hand, those which are unfounded, which lead to any change in the doctrine of faith itself, which consist in *easy questions*, which are neither necessary

nor profitable, neither for a thorough explanation of the true doctrine, nor for the effective defence of the same, confuse the minds and hinder the growth in the knowledge of the true doctrine: they are not allowable, but are to be rejected and excluded as real innovations. And these are the true characteristics of the so-called innovations as allowable or as unallowable and condemnable."

And because it is of the highest importance rightly to determine that necessary as well as justifiable growth, in distinction from unallowable innovations, those of Jena finally lay down more definite laws for that purpose (1028):

"The *first* characteristic to the perfection of the Church, or of the so-called allowable innovations is, that they be according to the analogy of the faith, and neither violate nor overthrow either directly or indirectly, and by necessary logical consequence, any article of the faith revealed in Holy Scripture and accepted by the universal Christian Church."

If it should appear that none of the diverging opinions is in contradiction with the analogy of faith,

"It is, in the *second* place, to be considered which opinion be best founded in the Holy Scriptures, or in the principles of reason and of nature (provided the dissension in itself concern a philosophical question, but necessary and profitable for the explanation of the true doctrine); and a well founded opinion and explanation is fairly preferred to an unfounded and false one."

And in the *third* place it is to be observed,

"Whether it contribute to the growth in the knowledge of the true doctrine, or perhaps remove an obscurity or a difficulty, by which the progress of those learning, or growth in thorough knowledge and understanding is hindered; or whether they be otherwise profitable and necessary to the defence of the true doctrine, and to obviate the evasions of the gainsayers."

"What assertions and declarations therefore having been called into question, and after diligent investigation have been found to be *first* according to the analogy of faith, *secondly*, well-founded, and *thirdly*, profitable and necessary to growth in thorough knowledge, cannot with propriety be rejected, but are to be thankfully received and maintained,

whether they have been years ago or only recently sought out from their true sources, and brought to light. On the other hand, all assertions, be they old or new, which, *first*, conflict either directly or indirectly with the analogy of faith, or, *secondly*, are unfounded and false, or, *thirdly*, are neither necessary nor profitable for growth in the knowledge of the true doctrine, but rather darken the same, confuse the learners, and injure and hinder them in their growth, are to be rejected."

We have thus far purposely allowed this school and tendency to speak entirely for itself. It is unnecessary to translate its fundamental ideas into the language and phraseology of the present: we recognize in it the proper medium between two false extremes; and in its representatives we see the representatives of a genuine sound Lutheranism.

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION.

By F. V. N. PAINTER, Salem, Va.

The Pope claims to be infallible. Hence, what the Papacy has been in the past, it is now and will be in the future; and what it has been in other countries, it is, in principle at least, in ours. It can abrogate nothing; it cannot, so far as principle goes, be inconsistent. In examining its character and claims, therefore, in other lands and in other times, we shall be better prepared to understand its attitude and appreciate its movements in our country. Without such preliminary inquiry, we will not be able to realize the force of the policy and aggressions of that power among us.

### THE VATICAN POWER.

This power is two-fold in its character—spiritual and temporal. In either aspect it is equally hostile to the intelligence and liberty of man. In its spiritual character, it claims to be the only true Church; the repository of all correct doc-

trine; to have at its head a person endowed with supernatural intelligence, and to be entitled to universal ecclesiastical supremacy. In virtue of these monstrous claims, the Church of Rome is bound to hold that all other Churches are heretical; that they have no right to exist, and that itself is the power for their destruction. And the Romish Church has ever been true to itself in following out the logical sequences of its doctrines. It has, in all the last centuries of its development, waged a cruel war against religious liberty; and to aid in overcoming opposition and freedom of thought, it has not hesitated to use the most diabolical agencies. It has employed spies to observe the conduct of individuals; it has seized men on trifling pretexts, and without any proper trial condemned them to the most cruel tortures and death; in short, it originated and used the Inquisition, which includes all that is unjust, outrageous and shocking to humanity.

In its second character, the Vatican is a political power. At the present day, in Protestant countries, it keeps this truth as much as possible suppressed; but without destroying its record and history in the past, it can never conceal nor deny it. The truth of its claims in this direction has been written in blood and sealed in the destruction of nations. It does not indeed seek after any particular form of government in preference to others, nor to unite all mankind under a favored secular monarch. But it wants all rulers to acknowledge allegiance to the Pope, bow in perfect submission to his will, and execute with slavish obedience all his commands. When this is the case, the Vatican will favor monarchy; it will cherish an aristocracy, and nurse with tender care even a democracy. The ideal aimed at is to have all nations, as so many provinces, acknowledge the authority of the Pope in such a way as practically to make him emperor of the world. But what are the demands which he makes of the civil power? All men must conform to the religion of Rome; no other religion shall be tolerated; all spirit of inquiry must be checked, except as it may subserve the interests of the Church; free schools, free press and free opinions must be suppressed. Until all this is done, there is hostility between

the Vatican and independent national existence. We have seen this principle of political supremacy illustrated in France, in Italy, and at quite a late period in Spain. The effects of it on a people are ignorance, superstition, poverty, and semi-barbarism,—elements which are necessary to the highest supremacy and prosperity of that ecclesiastico-political power. To show that the Vatican power is not misrepresented in the two-fold character we have distinguished, we make a quotation from an official declaration of Pope Boniface VIII. who filled the chair of St. Peter in 1294:

“The Pope has two swords, the spiritual and the temporal: the one to be wielded by the Church and the other for the Church; the one by the priesthood, the other by kings and soldiers, but this only on the hint or sufferance of the priest. One sword, however, must be subject to the other, and the temporal authority must be subject to the spiritual power. Wherefore we do declare, proclaim, decree and determine hereby that every human creature is subject to the Roman Pope, and that none can be saved who do not believe.”

#### ITS ORGANIZATION.

The organization of this Roman Power is the most perfect in the world. It is known as hierarchical, and consists of ascending orders of authority till at last all power centers in the Pope as the supreme head. The laity are subject to the priests; the priests to the bishops; the bishops to the cardinals; and the cardinals to the Pope. In every part of this perfect arrangement the most servile submission is required. This is secured on the part of the laity in the main, by ignorance and superstition; on the part of the higher orders by the most solemn and comprehensive oaths. A volition at the head of this body puts every limb into certain and effective operation. In the working of this powerful organization there is a controlling principle which gives it additional strength and renders it far more dangerous. That principle is that the end sanctifies the means, in virtue of which the most heinous crimes are made holy, provided they be committed in the interests of the Church. And since it allows falsehood, perjury and false witness, we can never believe



papal testimony in ecclesiastical affairs nor convict a criminal. When the ministers or organs of that power make protestations of friendship for our independent institutions, we know they are false, because in opposition to the principles which lie at the foundation of the papal system; and since such declarations are calculated to allay suspicion and arrest opposition, and hence are made righteous, however false they may be, we would naturally expect them to be sufficiently frequent. And such is the case.

At the present day this power is working chiefly by intrigue, in Protestant countries, and is gradually insinuating itself into greater prominence and authority. It is sending out armies of instructors, who are pushed forward in every possible way as educators; the principles of the Romish Church are promulgated with the utmost care, industry and perseverance; and every opportunity is improved to acquire political ascendancy which is used in the interests of the Papacy. This peaceable manner of proceeding is, however, the result of necessity and not of principle. If it were possible the Romish power would not hesitate to employ its temporal sword now any more than it did during the Reformation. This subtle, insinuating spirit has been perfectly exemplified in Prussia. The Roman Church was re-established there about the year 1815, on the condition of submitting to the civil laws. But it slowly and almost imperceptibly made aggressions upon the civil regulations of the country, till at last it was able to bid open defiance to the law. It was this aggressive and hostile spirit that excited the jealousy of Bismarck, and called forth those gigantic and successful efforts, on his part, for the overthrow of the Ultramontane political power in Prussia.

#### THE AWAKENING IN PRUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

This dangerous coalition of spiritual and political power in the Roman hierarchy has alarmed the greatest statesmen of Prussia and England. They understand the undying hostility of the Papacy to their independent forms of government; they see in the perfect organization and constant pro-

gress and aggressions of that power an imminent danger: and hence are taking steps, the one by legislation, the other by discussion, to secure permanent safety. But this matter cannot be better presented than in the words of the master minds which are leading these movements for self-preservation. The Emperor William of Prussia thus expresses himself to Earl Russell of England:

"The duty devolves upon me of leading the nation once more in the war maintained in former times, for centuries long, by the German Emperors, against a power whose domination has never in any country been found compatible with the freedom and the welfare of nations—a power which, if victorious in our days, would imperil, not Germany alone, but the blessings of the Reformation, liberty of conscience and the authority of law."

Bismarck, in a speech before the Prussian Diet, said of the Pope:

"He stands at the head of a compact party, has a well-organized semi-official press and an army of obedient priests, and has overspread us with a net-work of congregations; in short, no one possesses so great an influence as this Italian prelate. Even if he were a native, this power would be serious; but in this case it is a foreign monarch who possesses it, who, if he had the power to carry out in Prussia the programme he has solemnly proclaimed, would have to begin by destroying the majority of Prussians. The latter would either have to forswear their faith at once, or would risk losing all they possessed."

Gladstone, in speaking of the Vatican Decrees, says:

"It is, in my opinion, an entire mistake to suppose that theories like those of which Rome is the center, are not operative on the thoughts and actions of men. An army of teachers, the largest and most compact in the world, is ever sedulously at work to bring them into practice. Within our time they have most powerfully, as well as most injuriously, altered the spirit and feeling of the Roman Church at large; and it will be strange indeed if, having done so much in the last half century, they shall effect nothing in the next."

## THE CATHOLIC SPIRIT IN THIS COUNTRY.

With this partial survey of the character and claims of the Papacy, we are better prepared to understand its relation to this country. Without this preliminary inquiry, our apprehension of the question would have been very imperfect; but it has furnished the key which is sufficient to unlock all the mysterious and subtile movements of that wonderful organization. It follows, from the very constitution of the Vatican, that it is seeking supremacy in this country; and we know from its nature, as exhibited in the history of the past, that it will never give over the pursuit till it is victorious or destroyed. As the repository of the only true doctrines of salvation, it is pledged to spread them throughout the whole earth; and to aid in this great work, the political agency of every country is to be employed. It has carefully organized for the work in the United States. Not long since one of the highest princes of the church was established here, which fact renders the working of their political and ecclesiastical machinery more easy and perfect. This cardinal has obligated himself by an oath,

"To give all possible assistance in retaining, defending and recovering the Roman Papacy; to strive by every way and means to preserve and augment the rights, honors, privileges and authority of the Holy Roman Bishop, the Pope: and to seek out and oppose heretics and schismatics against the same our Lord the Pope with every possible effort."

He thus becomes the sworn enemy of our liberties and a large majority of our citizens. Nor is he a powerless dignitary. There are, at a low estimate, five millions of Catholics in our country, a large majority of whom are willing and obedient slaves to do his bidding and assist in executing his purposes. With its perfect organization, this is indeed a most terrible power.

The Romanists in our country, as elsewhere, have lately adopted at the suggestion of the Pope, a most effective principle in their work, namely, "do not agitate, but act." To a great extent this method of action has always been pur-

sued by that power; but after this infallible sanction we may expect it to be observed with increased carefulness. The Romish power could never, in this land of civil and religious liberty, accomplish any thing important by public discussion. The principles of uncompromising aggression which it represents would, when openly manifested, meet with effectual opposition from our people. Rome made a mistake in this respect a few months ago in New York in agitating the school question; and when it saw that it had aroused determined resistance, it subsided into almost perfect quietude on the subject. It is not likely again to commit the same mistake. And henceforth we may expect it to lay its priestly schemes more cautiously, carry them out more secretly, watch its opportunities more carefully and at favorable junctures take decided and effective action.

#### THE POINT OF ATTACK.

This is our free school system, which the Papal power is assiduously laboring to overthrow. But while the system prevails, it adapts itself to the circumstances and supplies our schools, especially in the cities, largely with teachers, thus preventing those developments as far as possible which would be antagonistic to the aims of the church. It has struggled with special violence for the abolition of the Bible from the free schools, well knowing that an acquaintance with the teachings of that sacred volume proves a serious hindrance to the promulgation of its distorted, perverted, unscriptural and in many instances blasphemous doctrines. So violent is the Romish church on this point that it does not scruple to combine with infidels, atheists and Jews to exclude the Bible from the schools. This has been done in Chicago and St. Louis. The following extract from the *Catholic World* but fairly represents the position of that power on the free school question:

"We of course deny the competency of the State to educate, to say what shall or shall not be taught in the public schools, as we deny its competency to say what shall or shall not be the religious belief and discipline of its citizens. We

of course utterly repudiate the popular doctrine that so-called secular education is the function of the State. \* \* \* If some Catholics in particular localities have supposed that the exclusion of the Protestant Bible from the public schools would remove the objection to them as schools for Catholic children, they have in our opinion fallen into a very great mistake. Of course our church disapproves the Protestant version of the Bible, as a faulty translation of a mutilated text; but its exclusion from the public schools would by no means remove our objections to them. The question lies deeper than reading or not reading the Bible in the schools, in one version or another. We object to them not merely because they teach more or less Protestant religion, but also on the ground that we cannot *freely and fully teach our religion* and train up our children in them to be true and unwavering Catholics; and we deny the right of the State, the city, the town or the school district to tax us for schools in which we are not free to do so."

It is easy to see why the Romish Church is endeavoring to destroy our free schools. They disseminate among the masses an amount of knowledge that is extremely unfavorable to the growth of that church. It prospers best in a land of ignorance, as its traditions, legends and superstitions there meet with a readier credence and acquire greater power. Hence we find that wherever it has supreme authority, it reduces its subjects to as ignorant a state as possible. In proof of this we refer to Italy, where in 1814 the Pope was restored to his temporal power. In addition to re-establishing the inquisition and suppressing the free press, he so manipulated the schools that 90 per cent. of the population grew up ignorant of the alphabet. And in the language of another, "we find the Middle Ages blushing at the company, of the darker Romanism of the 19th century."

In our free schools, further, more or less of Protestant principles is inculcated. To say nothing of the Bible or of other studies, history brings into comparison the effects of Papal dominion and Protestant government. And no person of any degree of intelligence can compare Italy, Spain, and South America, with England, Prussia, and our country, and not see the evils of the one, and the blessings of the other. In

our public schools, our youth are taught a spirit of independent and free inquiry. This is inculcated and practiced not only as a privilege, but also as a duty. They can never, therefore, be brought to yield easily or abjectly to the utterances of the priest, nor be made to believe the silly superstitions which are connected with the Romish Church.

If our free school system should be abolished, it would confer upon the Roman power, in addition to the negative benefits enumerated, several positive advantages. It would free Catholics from the taxation which, as citizens of our country, they are justly compelled to pay for the support of our public schools. They would supply private schools to a greater extent probably than they do the public schools with teachers, and exercise more freedom in the promulgation of their doctrines. They would do this in view of their boldness in thrusting themselves forward whenever any interest is at stake, and of their sagacity in discovering and seizing advantages. It would facilitate their design of gaining control, at least to a great extent, of the educational affairs of our country, in order that they may teach their religion to the young and plastic mind. In view of these advantages which they would acquire in the abolishment of the free school system, to say nothing of its repugnance to their religious principles, it must be plain why the papists are conspiring and laboring for its destruction.

But the free school is not the only point of attack upon our political institutions. The Catholic element is as rapidly as possible insinuating itself into every political position. By immigration to our shores, and other means of increase, the Catholics claim to be gaining ground, and that in twenty-five years they will have a controlling influence in our country. In political stations they do not forget their supreme allegiance to the Church nor their enmity to Protestants. In New York, not long since, their political influence was exerted in the disbandment of the only Scotch regiment, which is Protestant and has a brilliant career, while all the Catholic regiments, of which there are several, were retained in service. And the same partial legislation was shown in the

Gray Nuns' Act, which was lately repealed in the same State. Unless our people are watchful and guarded with respect to Catholic aggression, that power will go on gaining position after position, strengthening its foothold, till ultimately it will realize its hopes in becoming the dominant party in our land.

If this should ever come to pass, we have no reason to believe that it would any longer use only peaceable measures to carry out its purposes. The temporal sword, which belongs to Pius IX. just as much as it did to Boniface VIII., would be called into requisition, according to the tenets of the Church, for the propagation of its spiritual power and the suppression of what it considers heresy. This course is in contemplation by the authorities of Rome even now, and they are only quietly abiding their time. On the occasion of a Catholic parade in New York on St. Patrick's day, Bishop Wood is reported to have said with exultation:

"That will show the Americans how many voters we have now, and how many fighting men we will command when the fight commences, and commence it will on the school question."

And the same feeling we know, from their declarations and the very principles of the Church itself, must pervade the leaders of this Ultramontane power.

#### INFLUENCE OF OUR INSTITUTIONS.

Our institutions have a tendency to proselyte Catholics from their faith. The general diffusion of knowledge and the prevalence of a Protestant spirit have an unmistakable influence in freeing the youth of Catholic parentage, to a certain extent, from the superstitions and spiritual bondage of the Romish Church. And it has been estimated that Rome loses, in this way, fifty per cent. of her children born upon our shores. Our institutions have further a tendency to render liberal those who remain in the communion of the Church. It can not be doubted that many Catholics are loyal citizens, and could not, on the mere beckon of a priest, be incited to take up arms against their country. But, at the



same time, this is true only to a very limited extent. The majority of Catholics are so involved in the superstitious webs of that Church as to be incapable of independent thought and action. The masses have so high a reverence for the authority of the Church, and have their minds secretly so influenced against heretics, as to be ready to follow the priest whithersoever he may lead or direct them. This is exemplified in Catholic intolerance in the last centuries; and even in our own times it has been manifested in Spain, Mexico, and lately in Canada in the wanton destruction of a Protestant Church. "It can never be otherwise. It is part of that religion to train up its membership in this wonderful attachment to itself and hatred toward all that opposes it. And it must be vain ever to expect that the influence of any civil institutions, however wise and beneficent, will mold the majority of Catholics into true loyalty to the secular government.

#### THEIR DESIRE TO RULE THIS COUNTRY.

The Papacy has a special determination to become master of this country; and indeed the very existence of that Church in future ages would seem to depend upon such a consummation. Hence it is folly to expect the Vatican to relinquish its hopes and purposes easily. It will do so only after the severest struggle, and the arms of its power have been cut off. The leaders of this power foresee the future of our country. It has a capacity to support three hundred millions of people, and must, from its position between two oceans, exert eventually a controlling influence upon the religion, civilization and government of the world. It may be the object of the Vatican to gain possession of this tremendous power of the future, and it can then realize the goal of its magnificent dream of universal dominion. Or its object may be negative in its character, and aim at the destruction of the growing prosperity of our country, which, if it remain under Protestant influence, will in time evangelize the world, to the utter destruction of the Romish power. Rome's object is one or the other. And in either case it will leave

no means untried, secret or open, base or honorable, peaceable or belligerent, to gain the ascendancy.

#### WILL THERE BE WAR?

On the one hand, it is alleged that a war is imminent. On the other, that it is political gammon or a groundless sensation. The truth lies midway between the two extremes. The foundation for a terrible conflict is laid in the irreconcilable antagonism of the aims of the Papacy and the free spirit of a majority of our people. We have seen that the Papacy can never relinquish its purposes upon our soil; and on the other hand our people can never relinquish without a deadly conflict the blood-bought liberties of our fathers. It may be that our people will see the danger in time to prevent this ultimate and bloody issue. But only by such knowledge and such action, as has defended Prussia from Roman aggression, can we be saved from a religious war. It is doubtful whether such defensive action will be taken by our rulers, inasmuch as it will be contrary to the proverbial spirit of our institutions. There is, therefore, not only a possibility, but a probability that, within the next half century, our country will pass through a conflict whose terrors will be greater, and whose results more momentous, than have been known since the foundation of the world. And should it come, what will be the issue of such a conflict? It would result in the total overthrow of that mysterious power which has so long held millions of our race in darkness and chains. Antichrist would be destroyed, and the cry would go up from rejoicing millions in heaven and on earth, that "Babylon is fallen." Such an end seems to have been foreseen by St. John, who says that in "*one hour* is her judgment come."

## ARTICLE VIII.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

## AMERICAN.

**BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.**—*God and the Bible*, a Review of objections to "Literature and Dogma," by Matthew Arnold; *Supposed Miracles*, an Argument for the honor of Christianity against Superstition, and for its Truth against Unbelief, by J. M. Buckley; *The Christ of Paul*, or the Enigma of Christianity, a skeptical book, on the title page of which we read, "St. John never saw Asia Minor—Irenæus the author of the Fourth Gospel—The frauds of the Churchmen of the second century exposed," by George Reber; an edition of A Kempis' *Imitation of Christ*, with an Introduction by Rev. Frederick W. Farrar, D. D., F. R. S., author of "The Life of Christ," etc.; *Our Lord's Three Raisings from the Dead*, by Rev. Hugh Macmillan, author of "Bible Teachings on Nature," etc.; *Bible Word-Book*, a Glossary of Scripture Terms which have changed their meaning, or are no longer in general use, by William Swinton, author of "Harper's Language Series," etc.; *New Helps to a Holy Lent*, by Rev. F. D. Huntington, Bishop of Central New York; *Sin as Set Forth in Holy Scripture*, by Geo. M. Straffen, M. A.; *The Chaldean Account of Creation*, containing the description of the Creation, the Fall of Man, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the Times of the Patriarchs and Nimrod, Babylonian Tables and Legends of the Gods, from the Cuneiform inscriptions, by George Smith of the British Museum, with illustrations; *The Prayer-Gauge Debate*, (Congregational Publishing Society), edited by Dr. Jno. O. Means, containing almost all the prominent papers in the discussion, the letters of Tyndall and Thompson, editorials and articles from *The Spectator*, *Contemporary Review*, articles by Dr. Littledale, Dr. McCosh, Rev. Wm. Knight, Duke of Argyll, Canon Liddon, &c.; *Elijah the Prophet*, by Wm. M. Taylor, D. D.; *Apostasy Discussed*, or The Doctrine of the Final Perseverance of Saints investigated, by W. C. Huntington, A. M., and Rev. W. C. Collins; *Religion and Progress*, by Henry C. Pedder; *The Unseen World and other Essays*, by John Fiske, M. A.

**SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.**—*Air and its Relations to Life*, being, with some additions, the substance of a course of Lectures delivered in the summer of 1874, at the Royal Institution of Great Britain; *The True Order of Studies*, by Thomas Hill, D. D., formerly

President of Harvard College; *A History of Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, by Joseph Haven, formerly Professor in Amherst College; *The Indian Saint*, or Buddha and Buddhism, a Sketch, historical and critical, by Charles D. B. Mills; *A Treatise on the Theory and Solution of Algebraical Equations*, by John Macnie, M. A.; *The Nature of Light*, by Dr. Eugene Lommel, Prof. of Physics in the University of Erlangen, (International Scientific Series).

HISTORICAL AND BIOGRAPHICAL.—*D. L. Moody and His Work* on both sides of the sea, by Rev. W. H. Daniels, A. M., with Introduction by Rev. C. Fowler, D. D., LL. D.; *Life and Public Services of Henry Wilson*, by Rev. Elias Nason and Thomas Russell; *Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney*, by himself; *Christian Co-operation in Actual Life*, or United Brethren in Christ—a Review of their Origin and Progress, and some of their Elementary Principles, in five Parts, by John Vinton Potts; *Report of the Bonn Conference*, held in August 1875, translated by the Rev. Prof. Buel, of the General Theological Seminary, with a Preface by Rev. R. J. Nevin, D. D.; *Continental Sketches of Distinguished Pennsylvanians* by David R. B. Nevin, with an Appendix—containing important State Papers and Valuable Statistical and Historical Information, selected from Authentic Sources; *Percy Bysshe Shelley as a Philosopher and Reformer*, by Charles Sotheman, including an Original Sonnet by Charles W. Frederickson, together with a Portrait of Shelley and a View of his Tomb; *Presbyterians and the Revolution*, by the Rev. W. P. Breed, D. D.; *A Comprehensive History of Methodism*, by James Porter, D. D.; *Brief Biographies of Contemporary Statesmen*, edited by T. W. Higginson, Vol. III., French Political Leaders, by Edward King; *Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor*, author of "The History of Spanish Literature," etc.; *Washington, Bordoin, and Franklin*, as Portrayed in Occasional Addresses, by Robert C. Winthrop, with a few brief Pieces on kindred Topics, and Notes and Illustrations; *The Life of Jonathan Swift*, by John Forster, Vol. I.; *North Pole Voyages*, by Rev. Z. A. Mudge, second vol. on Arctic Exploration, published by Nelson & Phillips; *Memoirs of Eliphalet Nott, D. D.*, by C. Van Santvoord, D. D., with contribution and revision by Prof. Tayler Lewis.

POETRY.—*The Gates of Praise*, and other Original Hymns, Poems, and Fragments of Verse, by J. R. Macduff, D. D., author of "Morning and Night Watches," etc.; *Songs of Religion and Life*, by John Stuart Blackie, Prof. of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, author of "Self-Culture," etc.; *Songs of Three Centuries*, a Collection of Poetry, edited by J. G. Whittier; *The New Day*, a Poem in Songs and Sonnets, by Richard Watson Gilder.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Athenagoras*, Edited, for Schools and Colleges, by F. A. March, LL. D., with Explanatory Notes by W. B. Owen, A. M., adjunct Prof. of Chn. Greek in Lafayette College—one of the

Douglass Series of Christian Greek and Latin Writers; *A Paying Investment*, by Anna E. Dickinson; *Miscellanies*, Old and New, by Rev. John Cotton Smith, D. D.; *Round My House*, Notes on Rural Life in France in Peace and War, by Philip Gilbert Hamerton, author of "The Intellectual Life;" *The Devil's Chain*, by Edward Jenkins, M. P., author of "Ginx's Baby," etc., illustrated by Thomas Nast, a book on the subject of intemperance; *Pennsylvania German Manual*, for Pronouncing, Speaking and Writing English—a Guide-Book for Schools and Families, in three Parts, by A. R. Horne, A. M., Principal of Keystone State Normal School, Kutztown, Pa.; *The Student's Hand-Book of British and American Literature*, containing Sketches, biographical and critical, of the most distinguished English authors, from the earliest times to the present day, with selections, and questions adapted to the use of schools, by Rev. O. L. Jenkins, A. M., Priest of St. Sulpice, late President of St. Mary's College, Balto.; *Why We Laugh*, by Samuel S. Cox; *Select British Essayists*, to be contained in six vols., Vol. I. The Spectator—edited, with Introduction, and Biographical Sketches of the authors, by John Habberton; *Shakespeare and the Bible*, by James Reese; *Pocket Manual of Rules of Order for Deliberative Bodies*, by Major Henry M. Robert, Corps of Engineers, U. S. A.; *Wonders of Engraving*, by George Duplessis, "Scribner's Wonder Series;" *The Protection of Majorities*, with other papers, by Josiah Phillips Quincy.

## BRITISH.

BIBLICAL AND THEOLOGICAL.—*Concerning the Structure of Semitic Languages*, by Sir W. Martin; *Christianity and Morality*, Boyle Lectures, 1874-5; *Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, by R. S. Candlish; *Commentary on the Prophets*, Vol. I., by G. H. A. V. Ewald; *Religion and Science*, by S. T. Gibson; *Foundations of Religion*, by Sir J. B. Byles.

SCIENTIFIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL.—*Fragments on Ethical Subjects*, Posthumous papers, by George Grote, edited by Prof. Alexander Bain; *Light as a Motive Power*, by Lieut. R. H. Armit; *Aryan Origin of Gaelic Race and Language*, by U. J. Bourke.

BIOGRAPHICAL AND HISTORICAL.—*Life of Jonathan Swift*, by John Forster; *Life, Works, and Opinions of Henry Heine*, by Wm. Stigand, in two vols., octavo; *History of Christianity*, translated from Bourzique, Vol. I.; *Arctic Expeditions from British and Foreign Shores*, by D. M. Smith.

## ARTICLE IX.

## NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

LUTHERAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE.

42 North 9th St.

117 North 6th St.

*Bibliotheca Lutherana*; A Complete List of the Publications of all the Lutheran Ministers in the United States. By John G. Morris. pp. 139. 1876.

The author of this volume has performed a work that should be appreciated by the Lutheran Church, and also by the literary world. With a special fondness for the collection of facts and documents, he has presented the result of his labors in one department in this publication, which will be of special service to those who desire to see what Lutherans in the United States have been doing in the line of authorship. Many will be surprised at the number and variety of the writings of our hard-worked Lutheran ministers. Laboring under special disadvantages, they have not failed to improve their opportunities. Many of these writings are of an ephemeral character, but others will be of permanent value. The author truly says, "writers usually lay out their strength on Review articles," and the twenty-six volumes of a Quarterly Review, already completed, contain great treasures of Lutheran theology and literature. The volume is published in a very neat style, and so far as we have examined it, may be commended for its fullness and general accuracy. It contains a list of Periodical Publications, in English, German, Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian. In this list we observe that the *Evangelical Review* is marked as "*continued*," and the *Quarterly Review of the Ev. Luth. Church*, is added, with an error in the present editors. Some other errors have been allowed to slip in about periodicals and editors, as in the *Lutheran Observer*, and *Lutheran and Missiomy*. The volume is cordially commended to the curious and inquiring reader, as one that will entertain and instruct.

LUTHERAN BOOK STORE, 117 N. 6TH ST. PHILA.

*The Christian Year*, By Edward T. Horn, Pastor of Christ Church, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia. pp. 95. 1876.

This little volume gives evidence of considerable research, and furnishes information that many will be glad to have. The subject is presented under the general divisions: The origin of the Church (or Christian) Year: The Christian Year as a Whole, and different Con-

ceptions of it: The advantages which some find in this peculiar Division of time. While the author maintains a Protestant and Lutheran position, against Romish views, we regret to find him giving sanction to loose opinions of the obligation of the Lord's day. We are informed that the earliest Christians kept the Jewish Sabbath, but that before long Sunday took the place of the Sabbath as the great day of the week, having, it is supposed, the sanction of apostolic practice. The well known passage from the Augsburg Confession, according to our current editions, is cited, denying the divine obligation of the Lord's day. There is a tendency to depreciate the Lord's day in the undue multiplication of other festival days. The views of our author he admits are greatly in advance of those of Luther in the importance attached to the Church Year. Whilst we are glad to have the results of his studies in this line, we do not think the Lutheran Church will be benefited by the observance of the Church Year as set forth in this volume. Rather than this, we would agree with Luther, "That all feasts be done away, and only Sunday kept."

J. KOHLER, PHILA., PA.

S. K. BROBST & CO., ALLENTOWN, PA.

*Sonntagschulbuch für Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden.* Published by the General Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in North America. pp. 350. 1876.

This Sunday School Book, for the use of German Sunday Schools, has been prepared with evident care. It is much more churchly and more solid than a great many of our Sunday School publications. The feeling has been very general, that a large proportion of the books, both for singing and for the library in our Sunday Schools, have been really very poor. They aim chiefly to please by exciting the emotions, with little that is instructive or of any permanent value. Hence one publication follows another in rapid succession. There is nothing fixed in the minds of the young as permanent or enduring. There are manifest signs of a healthy reaction against the extreme of sensational singing and reading. This publication is designed to supply in the Sunday School the place of a good manual of devotion or Book of Worship in the Church. It will doubtless be found serviceable by those for whose use it is prepared.

PRESBYTERIAN BOARD OF PUBLICATION, PHILA.

*History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America.*

By Rev. E. H. Gillett, D. D., Author of "The Life and Times of John Huss," "The Moral System," "God in Human Thought," etc., etc. Revised Edition. Vol. I., pp. xxiv; 576. Vol. II., pp. xii; 605.

The author of this history had won for himself an honorable dis-



tion in the world of letters, when his unexpected death deprived his denomination of one of its most distinguished writers, and the Christian world of an able expounder of the truth. It may be regarded as an evidence of the general fairness and ability of this work, that although written when the Church was divided, yet it has been adopted as the History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, and has received the endorsement of both parties, or of the united church. Dr. Gillett had talents pre-eminently fitting him for such a task, and he has furnished a history of the denomination that is of great interest and must be of lasting value. Beginning with the first planting of Presbyterianism in this country, he narrates its struggles and growth, its first Presbytery, its Synod, and afterwards its General Assembly, its Adopting Act, its founding of Institutions, its conflicts of doctrines and measures, its revivals, etc., etc., until we contemplate it a mighty power in this land. The part of the work subsequent to the division of the Church is comparatively brief, and without detail. Only two chapters—"Results of the Division," and "*The Two Assemblies—Conclusion*"—are furnished. The history of the reunion is told in the "*Reunion Memorial*," published in 1870. This work we regard as one of very great interest and value, and deserving a place in every well-furnished library. In reading it we have been reminded of many things in our own Church. There have been much the same conflict in opinions and practices, and the same painful experience in dealing with controverted points. If we are to learn anything from the experience of our Presbyterian brethren, we may learn that we are not to prosper as a Church in doing God's work, either by excessive strictness in denominational peculiarities, or by renouncing our own principles to please others, by sectarian bigotry or by undenominational looseness. After years of controversy and strife and division, of warm and sometimes bitter discussion of points of difference, the Church again united with the same, if not greater, diversities than existed when she was rent asunder. There is perhaps to-day as much difference of sentiment in regard to doctrine and practice in the Presbyterian Church as there was fifty years ago, or as there is now in our divided Lutheran Church. They have learned the folly of trying to bind men too rigidly to a minute system of doctrine, or of making it a test of ecclesiastical fellowship that there be absolute agreement in all matters of faith. They have learned something of "a more excellent way." There are many points in which we Lutherans might learn something from our neighbors, without losing our own independence, or striving to imitate others regardless of whether right or wrong. This history is instructive for us as well as for them, and of abiding interest as the history of a part of the Church universal.

LITTLE, BROWN &amp; CO., BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott &amp; Co., Phila.

*A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, Being a Continuation of the "Dictionary of the Bible." Edited by William Smith, D. C. L., LL. D., and Samuel Cheetham, M. A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London. In two Volumes.—Vol. I. Illustrated by Engravings on wood. pp. 898. 1875.

Book-making only rarely reaches the high and important class of works to which this fine volume belongs. Common literary effort is content to aim at the production of works that cover less ground and are meant to fulfill a more limited office in a library. It is only in associated and combined labor, that these larger works of reference—a sort of library within a library—can be produced. When scholarly enterprise, devotion to learning, and pecuniary capital are united in the preparation and publication of such volumes, the result is looked for with great interest and usually accepted with great pleasure. It has been the good fortune of those who have undertaken and are carrying out the enterprise which is giving to the public the work, the first volume of which is before us, to have a field which was really calling for such labor. It has been comparatively unoccupied territory. For, however masterly is the great work of Bingham, and valuable are the smaller manuals of Coleman, Guericke, and others, they all fail to reach the fullness and compass of a genuine Cyclopaedia, such as properly meets the wants of Christian students of our day. No single writer can well undergo the labor involved in covering so wide a field in critical investigation, and combining the needed statements on such a variety of topics. We have, therefore, wanted a work of this kind, and it is rather surprising that it has been delayed so long.

No editorship could have been better suited to prepossess the public in favor of this work than that of Dr. Smith. The success that has marked his superintendence of the "Dictionary of the Bible," and of his editorial labors in other relations, must be accepted as the proof of eminent ability and fitness for this kind of service. His name has become a guarantee of high value in works to which he gives such labor.

The design and scope of the work are stated in the preface: "This work is intended to furnish, together with the 'Dictionary of Christian Biography, Literature, and doctrines,' which will shortly follow, a complete account of the leading Personages, the Institutions, Art, Social Life, Writings and Controversies of the Christian Church from the time of the Apostles to the age of Charlemagne. It commences at the period at which the 'Dictionary of the Bible' leaves off, and forms a Continuation of it: it ceases at the age of Charlemagne, be-

cause (as Gibbon has remarked) the reign of this monarch forms the important link of ancient and modern, of civil and ecclesiastical history."

It thus appears that the entire enterprise of which this is the beginning will be completed only in the volumes of the second division. The subject-matter of the whole period will thus be divided into two ranges. Biography, Literature and Doctrines are reserved for the later work. This makes each work more specific and definite. "The present work," as stated in the preface, "speaking generally, elucidates and explains in relation to the Christian Church the same class of subjects that the 'Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities' does in reference to the public and private life of classical antiquity. It treats of the organization of the Church, its officers, legislation, discipline, and revenues; the social life of Christians; their worship and ceremonial, with the accompanying music, vestments, instruments, vessels, and insigniæ, their sacred places; their architecture and other forms of Art; their Symbolism, their sacred days and seasons; the graves or Catacombs in which they were laid to rest."

The scope of the work is thus very broad, and the number and variety of the subjects which are included in it are immense.

The list of writers whose co-operation has been secured as contributors for the work—including those contributing to the 'Dictionary of Biography, Literature and Doctrine,' embraces a very large number of eminent names, known for their scholarly ability and reliability. One cannot but be struck, however, with the peculiar composition of this corps of contributors, in another respect. Almost the whole list—seventy-seven names—are representatives of the Church of England. Prof. Lipsius, of the University of Kiel, Dr. Dickson, of Glasgow, Dr. Milligan, of the University of Aberdeen, Rev. E. De Pressense, of Paris, Dr. Schaff, of New York, seem to be the only exceptions. In a work covering so many topics on which the little part of Christendom outside of the Episcopal Church entertain different views from those insisted on by that communion, it would seem proper, in order to secure impartiality, to have constituted the corps of writers on a more liberal or catholic basis. It is, of course, true that the authors of the enterprise have a perfect right to arrange for a distinctively Episcopal Dictionary, if they choose to do so, and may array and interpret all the facts and items of early Church History to favor their own views. Their right to do this none will question. But if we correctly understand the design of this work, it has been meant to be accepted as no merely sectarian book, but to present broadly and impartially the results of scholarly inquiry on the points concerned. The preface itself assures us of this purpose: "In treating of subjects like Church Government and Ritual it is probably impossible to secure absolute impartiality; but we are confident that

no intentional reticence, distortion or exaggeration has been practised by the writers of this work." We are bound to accept this declaration of honesty on the part of the writers. The actual contributors may have not *intentionally* colored or distorted the material, but it is surely not the best way to guard against one-sidedness, to have nearly all the writers from one denomination. The dissenting Communions of England and the Continent, and of America, could have supplied some scholarship worthy of a share in the determination of the teaching of this important work.

The articles forming this large volume, prepared by so many different writers, are, of course, not all of equal merit. But it requires but little examination to see that a high standard of accuracy and literary merit marks the work in general. As illustrating the scope and fullness of the more prominent discussions, the article on Baptism may be taken as an example—arranged under the following heads: "I. Terms used to designate Baptism. II. The order of Baptism in various Churches. III. The several Parts of the entire Ritual, viz.: Consecration of the Water, Interrogations and Responses (Renunciation and Profession); Preparatory Unction; Unclothing of the Catechuman; the Immersion; the Baptismal Formula. The subsequent Ceremonies, viz.: the Kiss, the Lighted Tapers, the White Garments, the red and white Thread, the Chaplet, and the washing of Feet. IV. At what Times, in what Places, and by whom, Baptism was administered; with what matter, in what mode, and at what age. V. Graphic representations of Baptism. VI. Literature. The subject of *Sponsors*, and that of Baptismal *names*, are treated separately in their alphabetical order." This outline will show that there is scarcely a question or point in the archaeology of the subject, on which the student will not find the proper information given. What he would have to search for through many volumes, or would be wholly inaccessible, is here gathered into convenient space for easy reference. The article on COUNCIL, extending over twelve closely printed pages, also illustrates the immense amount of information brought together in the plan of treatment of subjects in this work. The account under the word BISHOP, extends over thirty-two pages, and constitutes an elaborate discussion of the subject, together with a statement of the chief historical facts which come under the term in manifold relations in the early Christian ages. The length of the statements is generally well proportioned. Almost every subject that can be named, in the archaeology of the Christian Church, receives its due share of attention.

In a work of such high value, it seems ungracious to refer to any defects or faults. And yet for the very reason that it will, by its merits, take so conspicuous a place in our libraries, it is proper and ne-

cessary to treat it with the fullest candor. Some of the articles are defective in certain features; as, for instance, that on CREEDS is unsatisfactory and meagre in the facts connected with the development and forms of the *Apostles' Creed*; and that on COUNCIL wanting in proper fullness of information on the *Œcumenical* councils. Defects of this kind should be guarded against. In the article on BAPTISM a somewhat stereotyped statement of a certain class of writers is repeated, as usual, without the necessary proof, that immersion was "the ordinary mode of Baptism in primitive times." We take exception to the unnecessarily denominational mould into which some of the articles have been cast. The immense list of Church of England contributors has been referred to. Turning to the topics likely to be affected in this respect, we are compelled to feel that the care said to be taken to secure impartiality, has not always been as rigid as it should have been. We freely admit that the ecclesiastical standpoint of the writer must necessarily shape to some extent his presentation of these subjects. And we do not ask that he be untrue to the truth. But all this will hardly require the carrying of partisan writing to the extent, for instance, of the *elaborate plea* for episcopacy, found in the account of *Bishops*. We are glad to note that this thing is exceptional, and that most of the work is marked by evident candor and fairness.

The publishers have done their part well, in getting out this important work. Printed on substantial paper, in clear type and with well-executed and numerous illustrations, it forms a very fine volume. And despite the exceptions we have taken to some of its features, the work must, on the ground of its scholarly merit, and the immense amount of information it brings together from wide fields, in a department calling for attention, be accepted as worthy of the place it will take, as a necessity in our libraries.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., CHICAGO.

*Norse Mythology*, or The Religion of our Forefathers, containing all the Myths of the Eddas, systematized and interpreted. With an Introduction, Vocabulary and Index. By R. B. Anderson, A. M., Professor of the Scandinavian Languages in the University of Wisconsin, Author of "America not Discovered by Columbus," "Den Norske Maalsag," etc. Second Edition. pp. 473. 1876.

This book comes as a contribution of information on a subject that has been much neglected. Few, even of our educated people, have any very clearly defined idea of Norse Mythology, or the Religion of ancient Scandinavia. Considering our connection with the northern peoples, it seems strange that there should be this disregard of our ancestral myths, whilst the minds of school boys are filled with the mythologies of Greece and Rome. This volume will help greatly to secure

attention to the results reached by the pagan Northmen in their feeling after God, and in their interpretation of the powers of nature.

Prof. Anderson has done his work well. With thorough knowledge of the Scandinavian language and literature, he writes with genuine enthusiasm, as a son of the north. His appreciation of the good side of the Norse Mythology has occasionally betrayed him, indeed, into judgments too commendatory of its aggregate character. He is led to make too little of the distinction that must ever separate every false and mythical system, however poetic and wonderful, from Christianity as an actual revelation from God. Falsehood, however sincerely believed in, can *not* be "the same connecting link between God and man" as real truth. We may justly admire the poetic beauty and the numerous moral truths reached by the heathen in their earnest attempt to ascend through nature to the Powers above nature, but the daring fancies are not to be held as on a par with the real knowledge of the true God. We are sure Prof. Anderson admits all this, and other passages of his book are evidences of the fact, but his glowing enthusiasm with his subject has led him into some statements that need qualification.

The extent of the mythology here presented is indicated by the author's statement: "In its most original form this mythology was common to all the Teutonic nations, to the ancestors of the Americans and the English, as well as to those of the Norsemen, Swedes and Danes. Geographically it extended not only over the whole of Scandinavia, but also over England and a considerable portion of France and Germany. But it is only in Iceland that anything like a complete record of this ancient Teutonic mythology was put in writing and preserved. \* \* It is the Asa-mythology as it was conceived and cherished by the Norsemen of Norway and Iceland, which the old Norse literature properly presents to us."

About one-third of the volume is an introductory discussion of various points involved in the subject, such as the nature of mythology in general, and of the Norse mythology specially, a comparison of Norse with the Greek mythology, the different modes of interpreting it, the material it offers for art, together with the sources whence it is drawn.

In the body of the work, which is divided into three parts, the aim of the author has been to give a faithful, accurate and *complete* presentation of the myths, together with interpretations and reflections. He has adopted the *physical* interpretation, which regards the divinities as impersonations of the forces and phenomena of nature. This he believes to be the key to the interpretation of all mythologies. With this, however, he combines, to some extent, the ethical or spiritual interpretation. Part I. presents the mythology concerning the Creation and Preservation of the World, in three chapters. Part II. gives the Life and Exploits of the gods, in seven chapters. Part III.

is the mythology concerning Ragnarök, or the dissolution of the gods and the world. A Vocabulary is added, of the Principal proper Names occurring in Norse Mythology, with a brief synopsis of the character and exploits of the gods, explanations, etymological definitions, etc. Also a full index.

Altogether this is a work of much interest and value, affording very full information on a subject but little understood. The publishers have gotten it out in excellent taste—showing the superior work that is marking the books from that enterprising firm.

*A Manual of Gesture; embracing a Complete System of Notation, together with Principles of Interpretation, and Selections for Practice.* By Albert M. Bacon, A. M., Professor of Elocution. pp. 260. 1873.

We have no partiality for the drill of professional elocutionists. It often results in such artificial tones and unnatural manner as both to offend good taste and destroy true oratory. Yet the general principles of utterance and rules of gesture are exceedingly important; and, if rightly used, manuals for vocal culture and rhetorical delivery may be of the highest service to those who would train themselves for public speaking.

This book is distinctly a manual of *gesture*, and is full of rules and suggestions—made striking and clear by the wood-cut illustrations—from which the student of oratory will be profited. It is based, in part, on Austin's *Chironomia*, but develops a thorough and minute system of interpretation of gesture. The author has pointed out, with a great deal of discriminating judgment, the appropriate action for almost every variety of thought and feeling. Sentences for illustration are given under each rule, and miscellaneous examples and selections for practice are added in the end of the volume. The book is a good one of its kind, and the general principles which mark good manner in speaking are worthy of study by students who are looking to the pulpit or the platform.

*The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown.* With Extracts from the Oration of Æschines against Ctesiphon, and Explanatory Notes. By Martin L. D'Ooge, Ph. D., Professor of Greek in the University of Michigan. pp. 259. 1875.

It is seldom the eye is delighted with as beautiful a Greek print as greets us on these pages. The tinted paper and clear type are a fitting garb in which to present this great oration of Demosthenes. The aim of the editor has been to give the best results of criticism upon this oration, and lead the student to study it as a finished rhetorical production and as a master-piece of argumentation, rather than as a simple vehicle for teaching grammar. The notes are apt and judicious, affording,



in the references and explanations, the best aids to a just understanding of the text.

JAMES R. OSGOOD & CO., BOSTON.

For sale by J. B. Lippincott & Co., Phila.

*Among My Books.* Second Series. By James Russell Lowell, Professor of Belle-Lettres in Harvard College. pp. 327. 1876.

The readers of Prof. Lowell's first series "*Among My Books*" have been prepared by that to welcome the volume before us. The mental appetite was quickened by what it fed on. The present volume will not diminish the interest with which cultivated readers receive the author's productions. It is probably superior in substantial merit to the former series. It comprises personal and literary notices or sketches of Dante, Spenser, Wordsworth, Milton, and Keats. That of Dante is the fullest, forming more than one-third of the book. It presents the material for a just and discriminating appreciation of the great Florentine poet. The other papers, though somewhat less extended, are in Prof. Lowell's best vein of literary criticism and personal delineation. There are some features of his style that we do not like, and an occasional sentiment with which we cannot agree. But in the substantial excellences of true criticism, these papers must rank high. They will afford to students of Dante, Spenser, Milton, and Wordsworth, the suggestions of a mind enriched with the fruits of ripe belles-lettres culture.

*Songs of Three Centuries.* Edited by John Greenleaf Whittier. pp. 352. 1876.

The name of the author is sufficient guarantee that this collection of "*Songs of Three Centuries*" has been made with discriminating judgment and taste. Long familiarity with the poetry of our English tongue has necessarily fixed his preferences as to the productions of the chief writers, and prepared him to bring together what has seemed specially meritorious. His purpose is best stated by himself, in the Preface: "It has been my design to gather up in a comparatively small volume, easily accessible to all classes of readers, the wisest thoughts, rarest fancies, and devoutest hymns of the metrical authors of the last three centuries. To use Shelley's definition of poetry, I have endeavored to give something like 'a record of the best thoughts and happiest moments of the best and happiest minds.' The plan of my work has compelled me to confine myself, in a great measure, to the lyrical productions of the authors quoted, and to use only the briefer poems of the old dramatists and such voluminous writers as Spenser, Milton, Dryden, Cowper, Pope, Byron, Scott, Wordsworth, and the Brownings."

The contents are arranged according to the successive periods—from Shakespeare to Milton, from Dryden to Burns, from Wordsworth to

Longfellow. Selections are given from no less than three hundred and six authors. A full index of the authors is prefixed, as well as a table of contents—at the close are given indexes of first lines and of subjects. The editor has included rather an undue number of pieces from contemporary writers of little prominence, and unknown authors. But his object was to make a thoroughly readable book; and he has succeeded. It is just the sort of book to afford pleasure and profit in our spare hours.

*Geological Sketches.* By L. Agassiz. Second Series. pp. 229. 1876.

This volume is meant, in connection with the former series, to give, "in a permanent form, and in their original sequence, all the geological and glacial papers contributed by Prof. Agassiz to the 'Atlantic Monthly' during a number of years." It was the author's purpose to add to what is here presented a complete account of the drift phenomena of our coast and its outlying islands; and the material, in the shape of rough notes and sketches, had been accumulated. But his death prevented the accomplishment of the purpose. Of the five papers in this volume, the first is on the "Glacial Period." It is followed by discussions of "The Parallel Roads of Glen Roy, in Scotland," "Ice Period in America," "Glacial Phenomena in Maine," and the "Physical History of the Valley of the Amazon." They are full of information on the interesting scientific subjects of which they treat, and on which Prof. Agassiz was confessedly one of the most prominent authorities.

*A Paying Investment.* By Anna E. Dickinson. pp. 120. 1876.

This little volume discusses, in the author's well-known sharp and incisive style of thought and expression, some of the educational, political and social needs of our country. It sets forth the necessity of compulsory attendance of children at school, and a training of *all* the young, so as to make them not only capable and self-supporting citizens, but contributors to the common prosperity. Many of the faults and absurdities of the day receive sharp rebukes as she moves along the line of her main thought. The book is full of important facts and wholesome truths, all presented with rare force and raciness. The plea for woman's suffrage need not be admitted, but the great lessons of this little book ought to be read and studied all over our land.

JANSEN, M'CLURG & CO., CHICAGO.

*The Primer of Political Economy;* in sixteen Definitions and forty Propositions. By Alfred B. Mason and John J. Lalor. pp. 67. 1875.

It is a movement in the right direction, to give the rudiments of sound political economy to the scholars of our Common Schools and Academies. If our common school system is to prepare the young for an intelligent apprehension of their duties as citizens, this branch of

study has evidently a rightful place in the course. This little work has been prepared as a text-book for such instruction. The arrangement is the result of the experience of one of the authors in teaching. We are very much pleased with it. Though called a Primer, it gives mature views in systematized connection. It is a simple, clear, compact and well-digested presentation of the subject, admirably suited to its purpose as a text-book. Those out of school also will read it with profit.

HARPER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

*Cyclopaedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature.*

Prepared by the Rev. John McClintock, D. D., and James Strong, S. T. D. Vol. VI. Me—Nev. pp. vi.; 997. 1876.

As the previous volumes of this work have been noticed in the REVIEW, it seems unnecessary to say much beyond announcing to our readers the appearance of another volume. Some idea of the magnitude of the work may be gained from the fact that this sixth volume, of one thousand pages closely printed, brings us only to the letter N—NEV. Dr. Strong, who is now the responsible editor, is aided by a considerable number of contributors from different Churches. This work has met with much favor, and supplies a felt want among scholars. As in all works prepared on the plan of this one, some articles possess much greater merit than others. In this volume, some of the articles are very full and satisfactory, supplying the place of special treatises on the subjects which they discuss.

Each denomination will very naturally feel a special interest in articles bearing on its own Church. The present volume does not contain very many articles of this character, so far as the Lutheran Church is concerned. There are a few, however, that may have such interest for our readers. We notice that our friend, Dr. Morris, has a place among the distinguished divines, who have ceased from their labors and entered into their rest. The very best evidence that the Dr. still lives, is the preparation, and publication in the present centennial year, of a volume noticed in this number of the REVIEW. The Dr. bids fair to live a good many years, and neither he nor his friends will agree to this premature process of embalming. We do not know how the blunder is to be corrected, but it is always deemed very unnatural to attempt burial while any doubt remains as to the death of the subject, and here the proof of life, and that of vigorous life, is overwhelming.

The volume contains a carefully prepared article, by Prof. H. E. Jacobs, on Melancthon. Its scholarly character is seriously marred by the effort to sustain the position of Dr. Krauth in his *Conservative Reformation* in regard to Luther's agency in the preparation and final revision of the Augsburg Confession. As the unfairness of Dr. K. in

quoting authorities, and his perversion of the facts in the case, have been repeatedly pointed out, we cannot but regard this persistent endeavor to maintain positions destitute of any substantial proof, and against the plainest facts, as an evidence of zeal, not in the cause of truth, but of a partisan character. We have nothing now to do with the hypothesis of Rückert, but with the allegation that the Augsburg Confession was sent to Luther at Coburg 'for a *third time*, before it was delivered, and was approved by him in its *final form*.' Prof. Jacobs puts it, "During its preparation, the work was repeatedly revised by Luther, then at Coburg, in almost daily correspondence with Melancthon." As it took a letter-carrier several days to make the journey from Augsburg to Coburg, and a week is a moderate estimate for going and coming, it is not plain what Prof. Jacobs means by Luther and Melancthon being in "*daily correspondence*," especially as it is well known that Luther complained bitterly of the lack of correspondence, and that he was not written to more frequently. He writes of being "well fretted for *three whole weeks* with your silence." As this is a question of fact, and has been deemed of sufficient importance to be repeated over and over, we now challenge the proof. We offer the pages of the REVIEW to Prof. Jacobs, or any other reputable writer, to furnish evidence of this *repeated revision* of the Augsburg Confession by Luther while at Coburg. Let us have the proof if it can be adduced. We are prepared to show that the documents have been mutilated and the facts perverted to make out a case. In the absence of any clear evidence, and in the face of indisputable facts, we must hold that some men are endeavoring to manufacture, not write, history.

We hope the publishers of this valuable work may be so encouraged as to urge it forward to a speedy completion. It supplies what many feel the need of, and its completion will be hailed with great satisfaction.

*The Life of Jonathan Swift.* By John Forster. Volume the First. 1667—1711. pp. 487. 1876.

Dean Swift presents one of the most remarkable characters in the literary history of England. His life was full of enigmas which two centuries have not been able fully to solve. He exhibits the most diverse and opposite traits of character, and has been the subject of highest admiration and severest criticism. The elements of good and evil were strangely mixed in his composition, and manifest themselves in his life and writings. It is likely that the strange contradictions which appear in his life would have attracted less attention had he chosen a different profession, but his whole career seems out of harmony with our conceptions of that of an ambassador of Christ. He is probably best known to the world at large as the author of *Gulliver's*

*Travel's* and the *Tale of a Tub*. The former biographers of Dean Swift have left much of the story of his strange life, and especially his earlier years, untold. Mr. Forster aims to give a full and minute account of his life from its beginning to its close. As the Dean has been judged hastily by most critics, it will be no disadvantage that Mr. Forster appears in the character of an advocate or friend. The present volume covers forty-four years, from 1667 to 1711, and leaves the subject in London, not yet advanced to the title by which he is familiarly known. Two more volumes were expected to follow. Whether the death of the distinguished author, announced since the appearance of this first volume, will leave the work unfinished or not, we have not heard. It is to be hoped, however, that so interesting and valuable a biography will not remain incomplete.

*Elijah the Prophet*. By the Rev. William M. Taylor, D. D., Minister of the Broadway Tabernacle, New York city, author of *David, King of Israel*. pp. 217. 1876.

It is hazardous for any one to follow Krummacker on the same subject. His *Elijah the Tishbite* is a work of rare eloquence and power. But Dr. Taylor has aimed to do for English readers what Krummacker has done for German ones—to give us a vivid picture of *Elijah's* life and character, “by setting the prophet amidst the surroundings of his age and comparing him with the reformers of other days, to bring him so near to us that we may hear the throb of his great heart, and catch the inspiration of his life.” Whilst falling short of Krummacker's *Tishbite* in thrilling eloquence and graphic description, this volume is more practical in its character, and cannot be read without awakening a fresh interest in this great prophet of the old dispensation.

*Bible Word-Book*: A Glossary of Scripture terms which have changed their popular meaning, or are no longer in General Use. By William Swinton, author of “*Harper's Language Series*,” “*Word Book*,” “*Word Analysis*,” etc. Edited by Prof. T. J. Conant, D. D. pp. 106. 1876.

This little volume will be found of very great service in ascertaining the meaning of numerous passages in the Bible, more or less obscured on account of obsolete words, or words that have changed their meaning. It has been prepared with care, and the numerous illustrative passages cited from old English authors make it quite interesting as well as instructive. It should be in the hands of those for whose use it is specially designed—“*Sunday-School teachers, Bible classes and Bible readers generally*.”

A. D. F. RANDOLPH & CO., NEW YORK.

Through Smith, English & Co., Philadelphia.

*The Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century*, considered by  
Vol. VI. No. 2.

Robert L. Dabney, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, of the Presbyterian Church of the South, Prince Edward, Va. pp. 369.

This volume will likely be the subject of very diverse judgments. Some will regard it as a masterly exposure of a shallow materialistic philosophy, while others will probably consider it as lacking in calm and philosophical discussion. No one can fail to feel that the author is intensely in earnest, nor should any candid man find fault with his being so. Some, however, will think that he is too dogmatic, and at times uses language better adapted for popular impression than for learned discussion. It will be much more telling with a large class of readers than if its tone were more moderate. Believing that the views advocated, against the Sensualistic Philosophy, are sound, and that it is well adapted to meet the popular errors, it should have a wide circulation. If sometimes a little heated for such discussion, it is moderate in tone compared with some of the writers reviewed, and they cannot complain if they are met with a little of their own style, and that the lash they have attempted to use, is applied to themselves. We think the common verdict will be that Dr. Dabney is master of the field.

*David the King*; with a study of the Location of the Psalms in the order of David's Life. By the Rev. Charles E. Knox, author of "A Year with Saint Paul." pp. 465.

This is a very interesting and valuable addition to our helps to the study of the life of the royal psalmist. It aims to place us amid the scenes of his birth and early childhood, and then carries us along with him through his eventful life, until its close. The Psalms are introduced at the particular occasions on which they are supposed to have been penned. Both the Psalms and the life of the king are thus made more vivid and real. Intended for study in Bible classes, and elsewhere, as well as for private reading, it is divided into fifty-nine lessons, for so many Sundays, with questions to each lesson. It is also supplied with maps to illustrate the scenes in David's life. The work has been prepared with evident care, and we commend it to our readers.

*In the Holy Land.* By the Rev. Andrew Thomson, D. D., F. R. S. E., Minister of Broughton Place Church, Edinburgh. pp. 364.

This is another volume on that wonderful country—the Holy Land—or rather a volume of experience while traveling in that land. The author lets us know that it makes no pretensions to contain scientific explorations, but such observations as could be made during a visit to the most celebrated places of sacred story. He has a faculty for seeing what is to be seen, and of presenting in a very interesting form the results of his observation and experience. The reader may count on

finding this a most interesting volume of travel in the most interesting country in the world.

*Job's Comforters ; or Scientific Sympathy.* By Joseph Parker, D. D., Minister of the City Temple, London. With Introduction and Notes, by George Zabriskie Gray, Rector of Trinity Church, Bergen Point, N. J. pp. 38. 1876.

This is an ironical exposure of the utter worthlessness of modern scientific pretensions to meet the higher wants of the soul in the day of trial.

DODD & MEAD, NEW YORK.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*Christian Missions.* By Rev. Julius H. Seelye, Professor in Amherst College. pp. 207. 1875.

This is a sterling volume, by a sober and learned author, on a most important subject. It is a real addition to our literature on the grand theme of *Christian Missions*. We could wish this volume in every Christian family in our land, assured that it would help the cultivation of a missionary spirit. It contains six Lectures and a Sermon on the topics: *The Condition and Wants of the Unchristian World ; Failure of the ordinary Appliances of Civilization to Improve the World : The Adequacy of the Gospel : The Millenarian Theory of Missions : The True Method of Missionary Operation : Motives for a Higher Consecration to the Mission Work : The Resurrection of Christ the Justification of Missions.*

*Two Lectures upon the Relations of Civil Law to Church Polity, Discipline, and Property.* By Hon. William Strong, LL. D., Justice of the Supreme Court, U. S. pp. 141.

These Lectures were delivered before the Faculty and Students of the Union Theological Seminary in New York, during the winter of 1874—'5. They treat of an important, but complicated and difficult subject, and which cannot be very satisfactorily discussed in so narrow a compass. Still, the volume contains much that is important for ministers and churches to know, and which, if properly heeded, would save many and bitter controversies. We would be glad to furnish an analysis of the Lectures, and to point out some of the most important principles which may be considered as settled, did our space permit. Many of the unpleasant law-suits in which churches have been involved might have been avoided, if only the parties had understood a little better the principles of law applicable to their cases. Such discussions are in the interests of peace and good order, not to qualify parties to contend, and the distinguished author has rendered the Church at large a good service by furnishing these Lectures for publication. We may possibly at some future time advert to this subject



again, and try to furnish our readers with a digest of the principles which are here laid down and elucidated. In the meantime we commend this little volume of Justice Strong to all who desire to examine this subject.

A. S. BARNES & CO., NEW YORK.

*Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney.* Written by himself. pp. xii. 477, 1876.

No one can read this volume without feeling his religious nature stirred up to its lowest depths. Whatever difference of opinion may be entertained in regard to certain views entertained by Mr. Finney, and certain methods practiced by him, all candid minds must admit his intense earnestness and the great results accomplished by his ministry. Few men have possessed equal power in the pulpit, and the records of his preaching with the results which followed are simply wonderful. There is much in the spirit of Mr. Finney, and his treatment of other ministers and churches, that we cannot admire. He is very severe in his condemnation of doctrines and men honored by multitudes living and dead. He seems to regard himself as well nigh infallible. But with all his weaknesses—and they were not what commonly go by that name, but weaknesses of a strong and determined nature—he was a very extraordinary man and preacher. If asked the secret of his great power we should be disposed to say, his intense earnestness, his strong faith and fervent prayer, his direct aim at positive and immediate results in preaching. He was a John the Baptist, calling men to immediate repentance, and crying "*Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.*" It would be easy to find fault with some things in this autobiography, but we prefer to pass by the blemishes, and to dwell upon its bright shining features. It is a book to be read and studied especially by ministers, whose business it is to win souls. They will here see one, who truly felt himself to be an ambassador for Christ, beseeching men to be reconciled to God.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE R. C. A. NEW YORK.

*The Vedder Lectures, 1875.* "*The Light by which we see Light,*" or Nature and the Scriptures. A course of Lectures delivered before the Theological Seminary and Rutgers College, New Brunswick, New Jersey. By Tayler Lewis, LL. D., L. H. D., Union College. pp. 246.

These five lectures, on the Vedder Foundation, are characterized by all the depth of thought, wealth of learning, and power of presentation of which the distinguished author is such a master. The subjects are: The fearfulness of Atheism: The denial of the supernatural: The Cosmical Argument.—Worlds in Space: Cosmical Argument continued.—Worlds in time: The Kingdom of God; or, the greatness

of the Bible Theism, as compared with the physical, scientific, and philosophical :—Dr. Lewis in this volume does not appear as the timid apologist for the Bible and the Supernatural in Christianity, but portrays in language that is sometimes fearful the appalling character of Atheism—or a system of nature that excludes God. “The fearfulness of Atheism” is a vivid picture of the cold and cheerless character of that system. The third and fourth lectures dwell upon topics which are favorites with the author. The closing lecture exhibits the grandeur of Bible views of God and the universe, as compared with the great swelling words of science and philosophy. This volume of one of the finest scholars of the age may be commended to some of the shallow pedants who afflict our generations with their pretensions.

E. P. DUTTON & CO., NEW YORK.

*Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford*, chiefly during the years 1863—1865. By H. P. Liddon, M. A., Student of Christ Church, Prebendary of Salisbury, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury. pp. 291. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1868.

It is scarcely necessary to commend a volume of Liddon. He is among the most learned and eloquent of the divines and preachers of the English Church. This volume of sermons, preached a number of years ago, bears the marks of his subsequent writings, which have won him so distinguished a reputation. Scholarly, spiritual, impassioned, they take hold of intellect and heart.

*The Hulsean Lectures for 1874. Sin as set forth in Holy Scripture*, by George M. Straffen, M. A., Vicar of Clifton, York. pp. 107. 1876.

The contents of this little volume are: The Sense of Sin; The Nature of Sin; The Organ of Sin; The Consequents of Sin; The Propitiation for Sin. These discussions are brief, but clear, and cannot fail to impress the thoughtful reader.

*Religion and Progress: An Essay*. By Henry C. Pedder. pp. 82. 1876.

This is a most interesting and valuable essay on a most important topic. It contains weighty thoughts for the friends of religion and sound philosophy. It deserves a wide circulation.

*The Clergyman in His Home*. An address to the candidates for Holy Orders. By the Rev. E. H. Bickerteth, M. A. pp. 32. 1876.

G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS, NEW YORK.

*Faith and Modern Thought*. By Ransom B. Welch, D. D., LL. D., Professor in Union College. With Introduction by Tayler Lewis, LL. D. pp. xxx.; 272. 1876.

This is another one of the many volumes called forth by the tendency of modern speculation. It is a very calm and judicious discus-

sion of some of the leading points of controversy. There is no strain for effect, but Dr. Welch writes like one who is not afraid to face the truth. The Introduction, by Dr. Tayler Lewis, adds to the value of the volume. It is really surprising how much that passes for science has no claim to any such distinction. This is clearly shown by our author, and the claims of a genuine faith vindicated.

*The True Order of Studies.* By Rev. Thomas Hill, D. D., Formerly President of Harvard University, author of "Geometry and Faith," etc., etc. pp. 163. 1876.

This little work is on a very important subject. We think that there is much study out of the "true order;" but are afraid that the discussion in this volume is too scholastic for general reading, and not sufficiently practical to insure much attention. It is worthy the special consideration of educators.

WARREN F. DRAPER. ANDOVER, MASS.

*The Principles of Textual Criticism;* with a list of all the known Greek uncials. And a table representing graphically the parts of the text of the New Test. contained in each. By Frederick Gardner, D.D., Professor in the Berkeley Divinity School. Reprinted from the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April 1875. Revised and corrected.

The title of this publication sufficiently indicates its character. It will be found serviceable to critical students.

☞ Notices of the following books crowded out of this number will appear in the next.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Through Smith, English & Co.

*Life and Labors of Duncan Matheson.* By the Rev. John McPherson.

*Haunted Rooms.* A Tale. By A. L. O. E.

*Lilie, or Thistledown.* By Julia A. Mathews.

*The Story of the Apostles:* or the Acts Explained to children. By the author of "Peep of Day," etc.

*The Gates of Praise.* By J. Macduff, D. D., author of *Morning and Night Watches*, etc.

T. WHITTAKER. NO. 2., BIBLE HOUSE. NEW YORK.

(Through J. B. Lippincott & Co.)

*Miscellanies Old and New.* By John Cotton Smith, D. D.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

*The Religious Sentiment, etc.,* By Daniel G. Brinton, A. M., M. D.

## CONTENTS OF NO. II.

Article.	Page
<p>I. RECENT STUDIES IN CHRISTOLOGY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Prof. W. H. WYNN, A. M., Ames, Iowa.</p>	<p>161</p>
<p>II. THE COSMOLOGY OF PARADISE LOST,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By JOHN A. HIMES, A. M., Professor of English Literature in Pennsylvania College.</p>	<p>187</p>
<p>III. IMPORTANCE OF TEACHING THE BIBLE TO THE CHILDREN,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. JAMES W. RICHARD, A. M., Prof. in Carthage College, Ill.</p>	<p>204</p>
<p>IV. THE TRUTH'S TESTIMONY TO ITS SERVANTS,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By M. VALENTINE, D. D., President of Pennsylvania College.</p>	<p>231</p>
<p>V. THE MINISTERIUM,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By Rev. Prof. S. A. ORT, Louisville, Ky.</p>	<p>249</p>
<p>VI. THE THEOLOGY OF THE SEVENTEENTH CENTURY,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Translated from the German by Rev. A. MARTIN, Professor in Pennsylvania College.</p>	<p>264</p>
<p>VII. THE ROMAN CATHOLIC QUESTION,.....</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">By F. V. N. PAINTER, Salem, Va.</p>	<p>285</p>
<p>VIII. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE,.....</p>	<p>297</p>
<p>IX. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,.....</p>	<p>300</p>

## AMERICAN.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Historical and Biographical—Poetry—Miscellaneous.

## BRITISH.

Biblical and Theological—Scientific and Philosophical—Biographical and Historical.

## NEW BOOKS.

Bibliotheca Lutherana—The Christian Year—Sonntagschulbuch für Evangelisch-Lutherische Gemeinden—History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America—A Dictionary of Christian Antiquities—Norse Mythology—A Manual of Gesture—The Oration of Demosthenes on the Crown—Among My Books—Songs of Three Centuries—Geological Sketches—A Paying Investment—The Primer of Political Economy—Cyclopædia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature—The Life of Jonathan Swift—Elijah the Prophet—Bible Word-Book—The Sensualistic Philosophy of the Nineteenth Century—David the King—In the Holy Land—Job's Comforters—Christian Missions—Two Lectures upon the Relations of Civil Law to Church Polity, Discipline, and Property—Memoirs of Rev. Charles G. Finney—The Light by which we see Light (The Vedder Lectures, 1875)—Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford—Sin as set forth in Holy Scriptures (The Hulsean Lectures for 1874)—Religion and Progress—The Clergyman in His Home—Faith and Modern Thought—The True Order of Studies.

## THE FOREIGN QUARTERLIES AND BLACKWOOD.

*The London Quarterly Review*, has, among other articles, "Forster's Life of Swift," "The Armed Peace of Europe," "Wordsworth and Gray," "Modern Methods in Navigation and Nautical Astronomy."

*The Westminster Review*: "Old Catholicism," "White Conquest," "The Origin and Development of Man," "The Philosophy of Pessimism," "The Intellectual Revival of the Middle Ages," "The Laws of Musical Expression."

*The Edinburgh Review*, *British Quarterly Review*, *Blackwood's Magazine* have their usual installments of interesting and valuable matter.